Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-085
Tuesday
3 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-085 *3 May 1988*

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Peresada Views May Day, Afghanistan, Arms Pacts *[PRAVDA 1 May]* 1
'Further Progress Possible' on Summit Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Apr]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reagan Remarks, U.S. Rights Record Condemned *[Vasilyev in PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 5
Shultz Talks 'Improved' Treaty Prospects *[Glazunov]* 7
U.S.-Soviet Memorandum on Reactor Safety Signed 8
U.S. Plans To Increase Arms Shipments Abroad 8
Confidential Report Revealed 8
'Expanding' Shipments Criticized 9
U.S. Administration, Congress Differ on SDI *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 9
Bill Banning Space Weapons Introduced in Senate 9
Poll Shows Most Americans Support INF Treaty 10
Senators Press Greece To Keep U.S. Bases 10
Reagan Receives Finnish Prime Minister 10
Reagan Extends Sanctions Against Nicaragua 10
U.S. House Votes Against Nicaragua Invasion 11
Dobrynin Received Riggs Bank Board Chairman *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 11

China

Commentary Hails PRC Trade Union Contacts 11
Qian Qichen Comments on International Relations 12
China To Reduce Machinery, Equipment Imports 12

Northeast Asia

Maj Gen Markelov Criticizes 'Team Spirit' *[Pyongyang KCNA]* 12
DPRK's Kim Yong-nam Visits Soviet Union 13
Meets With Shevardnadze *[Levechev]* 13
Attends Belorussian Festival 14
Holds Talks in Minsk 14
Cooperation Commission Meeting Held With DPRK 14
Murakhovskiy Attends Talks *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 14
Japanese Ambassador Addresses Soviet Public 14
'Hoppo Ryodo' Situation Noted *[Tokyo KYODO]* 15
Soviet-Japanese Fishery Committee Session Opens 15
Japanese Quota To Be Cut *[Tokyo KYODO]* 15
Salmon Catch Protocol Signed *[Tokyo KYODO]* 15
UN Law of Sea Convention Cited 16
Zilanov Remarks on Conclusion 16
Briefs 16
Ship-Repairing Enterprise 16
Soviet-Japanese Resort Complex 17

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese Envoy Expounds Position on Islands *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Apr]* 17
SRV Wants Hun Sen-Sihanouk Meetings To Resume 17
Gilashvili Delegation Discusses Indonesian Ties 17

Near East & South Asia

'Conditions Exist' for Good Pakistan Relations *[IZVESTIYA 1 May]* 18
Afghan Committee Prepares To Receive Refugees 19
Camps Established 19
'Assistance Fund' Cited 19
'Massive' Mudslide Kills 35 in Afghanistan 19
Najibullah Greets Afghan Officers From USSR 19
Weekly Praises Kuwaiti Handling of Hijack *[Kuwait KUNA]* 20
Syrian Official Thanks Ryzhkov for Greetings *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 20

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopian Leader Refutes Charges on Famine Aid 20
Envoy Discusses South African Policy, Reforms *[Johannesburg THE STAR 29 Apr]* 21

East Europe

Jaruzelski: Strike Control Will Prevent Anarchy 21
May Day Demonstrations Not Disrupted 21
PPR Government Hopes To Counteract Inflation *[PRAVDA 2 May]* 22
Gosplan Chief Maslyukov Receives Polish Minister *[PRAVDA 28 Apr]* 22
Further Reportage on Vorotnikov SFRY Visit 22
Talks With Gracanin 22
Signs Cooperation Program 23
Visits Aluminium Combine 23
Montenegro Meeting *[PRAVDA 29 Apr]* 23
Tours Budva, Kotor 24
Returns to Moscow *[PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 24
Mojsov Expresses Interest in Gorbachev Proposals 24
Gromyko Accepts Ceausescu Invitation To Visit *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 25
Bulgarians Have Model for Ministry Restructuring
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Apr] 25
Mueckenberger Ends Visit to Ukraine *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 20 Apr]* 25
Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society Meets 26

West Europe

Adamishin Holds News Conference in London 26
Voss Interviewed on Parliamentary Visit to UK 26
Dobrynin Meets With FRG Opposition Leaders *[PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 27
Gorbachev Congratulates Luxembourg CP Chairman *[PRAVDA 30 Apr]* 28

Latin America & Caribbean

Ortega Notes Conditions for Talks With Contras 28
Briefs 28
Cuban Pipeline Project 28

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Reader Warns Against Gorbachev Removal *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 30 Apr]* 29
Letter Calls for Radical Party Reforms *[PRAVDA 2 May]* 34
Individuals' Ideas on Reforms, Media Coverage *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 28 Apr]* 38
Crimean Tatars' Resettlement To Begin Early May *[Tashkent]* 39
Arkalyk Airline Incident Ends Safely 39
Khrushchev Son on Father's Treatment, Memoirs *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 39
Sharper Line Between Success, Failure Urged *[IZVESTIYA 27 Apr]* 40
Estonian Economic Management Plan Approved 41

Economic

Statistical Offices' Reporting Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 27 Apr]* 41
Presidium Resolution Surveys Proposals, Comments *[IZVESTIYA 28 Apr]* 42
Consumption's Role in Development Analyzed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 21 Apr] 44
Economists Argue Need for 'Normal Market' *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Apr]* .. 46
State Association Regulation Change Explained
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Apr] 48

Scientific

Physicist Legasov Dies; Gorbachev Signs Obituary 49
Ligachev, Ryzhkov at Funeral 49
Sagdeyev Assesses 'Crisis' of 'Big Science' *[IZVESTIYA 28 Apr]* 49
Minister Lukonin on AES Safety Developments *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Apr]* 53
'Mir' Cosmonauts' Activities Continue 56
Briefs 56
'Fedorov' Expedition Successful 56

Military

False Alarm Shows Need for Civil Defense Review 56
Complaints Aired About VUZ Military Training *[IZVESTIYA 21 Apr]* 56

Peresada Views May Day, Afghanistan, Arms Pacts
PM011630 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 88
Second Edition p 4

[Vladimir Peresada "International Review": "The World This Week"]

[Text] In the issue published on 1 May 1918, PRAVDA wrote: "Year after year, the Russian working class greeted May Day at secret gatherings in the forest and at demonstrations that were banned and dispersed.... For the first time in history, the proletariat is celebrating May Day in Russia not as an oppressed class, but as a victorious class." Here, too, the May Day slogans of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee were printed. One of them declared: "Against imperialist carnage, for peace and the fraternal alliance of working people of all nations."

Today the workers and all the working people of our country are marking the 71st Soviet May Day, marking it as a festival for the whole people. Millions of people on all continents of the world have joined the sea of columns with us. The most important slogans carried by the demonstrators are similar, if not in their text then in their essence, to that proclaimed by the Communists of Soviet Russia on the first May Day after the revolution.

Socialism and peace are indivisible. Our class interests coincide fully with interests that are now priorities for all mankind, with its desire to avoid nuclear war and preserve life on earth. The Soviet Union makes the greatest possible efforts to resolve these tasks that have arisen in the nuclear and space age. The new political thinking, which is forging itself a path ever more confidently and winning over ever more supporters in the world, has become an instrument of their fulfillment. But this is no easy matter. The events of the past week showed once again that the renewal of international relations is a complex, contradictory process and that ideas based on distrust and the inclination toward total confrontation are still having tangible effects.

Observing Commitments [subhead]

The signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan was a weighty proof of the constructiveness of a policy in the spirit of the new thinking. This is noted again and again by the foreign mass media as they comment on the Soviet Government statement on the Afghan problem published last Wednesday.

What next? Naturally, it is a matter of putting these agreements into practice. The future of the political settlement over Afghanistan now depends on how responsibly, consistently, and energetically the whole range of commitments assumed by the sides are put into practice. Judging by the government statement, the Soviet Union not only regards this as the most important condition for achieving a settlement, but it is ready to set an example of strict compliance with the spirit and letter of the Geneva agreements, the British news agency Reuter notes. "The firmness of the USSR's position makes a great impression," a broadcast on the radio station France Inter said. "Refuting the doubts and skepticism aroused by the complexity of the situation, Moscow confirmed that the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan will begin, as planned, on 15 May and will end 9 months later."

Yes, the Soviet Union intends to act in full accordance with the Geneva agreements. No doubts should arise on this score: The accord on the withdrawal of Soviet troops is irreversible.

The Government of Afghanistan also intends to be guided by an honest, consistent approach. This was reaffirmed at the ceremonial meeting held in Kabul on 25 April to mark the 10th anniversary of the April Revolution. Speaking at the meeting, President Najibullah said that the Afghan leadership will firmly fulfill the commitments arising from the agreements, counting, naturally, on the same attitude on the part of the other states involved in the settlement.

What is the point of reminding people of this, meaning Pakistan and the United States, when the signatures of their plenipotentiary representatives are on the Geneva documents? the Voice of America asks. Unfortunately, not only is there some point—there is a necessity, since the completion of the Geneva process statements have begun to appear, some of them in the past week, which run counter to the agreements reached. This could not but cause concern in both Kabul and Moscow. The Soviet Government statement, the American agency AP notes, contains warnings against any attempt to depart from the accords.

Serious concern is also expressed at the United Nations, which made a great contribution to the drafting of the Geneva agreements. "Unfortunately, voices can be heard trying to interpret the agreements in such a way as to undermine their significance," UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar stated. He also stressed the need for strict fulfillment of the documents signed.

Here is an example of how people are trying to make it more difficult to implement them. Last Tuesday it was announced that a draft resolution had been submitted to the U.S. Congress House of Representatives, proposing the drafting of a plan for aid through the United Nations to Afghan refugees returning home, and also the organization of international economic aid to Afghanistan—ideas apparently worthy of attention. But at the same time, the draft contains provisions which will in practice promote not the "restoration and economic revival of Afghanistan," but continuing bloodshed. The United States, it says, should not "stop aid to the Afghan resistance" until the President is sure that all Soviet troops have been withdrawn from Afghanistan and all

Soviet aid to the Afghan Government has been stopped and that the situation in the country will ensure the "formation of an acceptable government."

Why are they doing all this? Why put forward a condition associated with the withdrawal of our troops when it is clear that a verification mechanism will operate under UN auspices? Why are they demanding an end to Soviet aid to Kabul, thereby interfering in the sphere of purely bilateral interstate relations? To what end do they speak of an "acceptable"—to whom?—government, when achieving accords among themselves on a nationwide basis is a matter for the Afghans themselves?

The answer is, as the saying goes, plain to see. Even now, when the agreements have already been signed, some people cannot rest, because the agreements create the conditions for resolving Afghanistan's internal problems without outside interference. They are particularly alarmed by the fact that the base for interference is narrowing, because the vast majority of Afghans greeted the conclusion of the agreements with approval and hope. In the situation that has emerged, they are patently gambling on the "irreconcilable opposition," entrenched in Peshawar, which is stubborn in its reluctance to acknowledge the results of the Geneva process and refuses to cease hostilities. It is, first and foremost, these people whom the United States now calls the "Afghan resistance," in the hope that continuing military aid to them will continue to provide a "channel of influence on Afghan affairs."

Naturally, this position does not further the settlement cause. Surely the emergency deliveries of arms to the "Afghan rebels" which the United States, according to reports from Islamabad, began to carry out the other day by means of an airlift look like an attempt to undermine the agreements? Such actions only encourage extremists. The Peshawar opposition, torn by disagreements and disputes, nonetheless represents a major destabilizing force. People are still dying because of the sorties of armed groups associated with it. The latest example was the blowing up of a truck with dynamite in downtown Kabul the other day. That truck, it became known, had come from Pakistan—from the place to where the United States is urgently sending weapons and ammunition.

The adventurism of the opposition that has settled in Peshawar, that is, on Pakistani territory, is an obvious obstacle not only to the restoration of peace in the long-suffering Afghan land, but also to the normalization of the situation around Afghanistan. The responsibility that rests on Islamabad is, therefore, all the more serious. After all, did not the Pakistani Government sign an undertaking not to allow on the country's territory the presence, concealment in camps and bases or by any other means, organization, training, financing, supply, and arming of political and other groups which intend to conduct subversive activity against the Government of Afghanistan?

With the conclusion of the Geneva agreements, the prospect of settling a very acute regional conflict is within reach. But only given strict observance of these agreements by all who signed them can the settlement become a reality.

When Stereotypes Get in the Way [subhead]

Two approaches—the broad approach based on the new thinking, and the narrowly pragmatic approach reflecting the stereotypes of the past—could be seen this week on questions of disarmament, too.

A characteristic example is the situation taking shape around the approval by the U.S. Senate of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-and Shorter-Range Missiles. In Washington, as in Moscow, the ratification procedure has reached its final stage. Very many members of the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress have already declared themselves to be supporters of the treaty. The possibility of its coming into force in the near future would appear to be a real one, especially since the next Soviet-American summit meeting, in Moscow, is approaching. Such an important fact as the treaty's ratification would undoubtedly create a particularly favorable atmosphere for progress toward another agreement, on strategic offensive arms reduction.

But last week debates aimed, in effect, at postponing ratification were imposed on the Senate. The initiators were representatives of the Democratic majority, who openly called on the legislators "not to hurry." The reason is explained thus: It is not clear whether the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles extends to new arms of the same range that could appear in the future: lasers, for instance. Although Secretary of State Shultz explained in a special letter that the administration has a "common understanding" with the Soviet Union concerning all systems of land-based weapons indicated in the treaty, both present and future, the advocates of postponement hold their ground. "I do not agree that we can trust the Russians on this," S. Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated, for instance. According to him, a provision must be added to the treaty making ratification conditional on obtaining an "exhaustive confirmation from the Soviets of their concurrence" with the administration's position on future weapon systems.

What is this—genuine distrust of us, or an attempt to use this as cover for an election move, the desire to "spite" the Republican administration and prevent the rival party from scoring points on the eve of the presidential elections? I think it is some of each. But what is clearly lacking is a responsible approach to such an important

document as the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. It would be regrettable if those who are now trying to play games with it were to succeed in stopping the ratification process and delaying the start of the real disarmament process.

There is a month to go before the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow, and in the Soviet side's opinion, that time should be used as efficiently as possible to ensure results at the meeting. First and foremost, a solution should be sought on the central problem—further progress in drafting the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms in conditions of compliance with the ABM Treaty and nonwithdrawal from it for an agreed period.

Although many problems still remain which must be resolved in the process of drafting a strategic offensive arms treaty, on the whole, the sides have now reached a point where rapid progress is possible, given mutual efforts. The desire to study carefully all aspects of the draft treaty and the realistic assessment of the remaining differences in positions should not, however, provide grounds for a slow pace of work on the Geneva documents.

The characteristic approach of the United States and other Western countries to disarmament problems was also manifested at the NATO Nuclear Planning Group session which ended in Brussels on Thursday. On the one hand, the participants gave a high assessment of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and came out in support of the idea of a 50-percent reduction in Soviet and American strategic offensive arms. But on the other, they declared their intention to "ensure the continuing capability and effectiveness of the combination of conventional and nuclear arms, including nuclear forces in Europe, which will, in case of necessity, be maintained at an up-to-date level." In essence, a course was set of "modernizing" nuclear arsenals in the future and "compensating" for the American missiles in Europe that are due for destruction.

And what powerful pressure was brought to bear on Denmark over the decision of the country's parliament to tighten up the rules for foreign ships carrying nuclear weapons to call in Danish territorial waters and ports. As a result, the Danish defense minister announced that the government would refuse to implement the resolution adopted by parliament. Outside interference in the national policy of a sovereign country, even though it is an ally in the bloc, is beyond dispute here.

The nature of the West's vacillations on disarmament questions is largely determined by the tenacity of the old thinking, especially the "Soviet threat" stereotype. But sensible speeches can also be heard. A number of statements of this nature were made by FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher the other day.

"Why," the minister said, "in the course of an attempt to establish a new kind of stability, based on cooperation and trust, should we proceed from the premise that the Soviet leadership will display less responsibility and rationality here than with the operation of the deterrence system? Europe would be missing an opportunity if, at this historic moment, it trusted more to the laws of the buildup of armaments and counterarmaments than to the desire (and this is what we are talking about) to gradually reduce through talks the capability for aggression, for threats, including the other side's capability, and at the same time, to increase step by step the capacity for cooperation and confidence-building on both sides—in other words, to act in such a way that mankind gains the capacity for survival.... This path requires a peaceful offensive against prejudice, arrogance, and thoughtlessness. It requires an awareness that peace throughout the world cannot ultimately be based on weapons alone."

I think it would be useful for many statesmen in both Western Europe and America to listen to these remarks.

'Further Progress Possible' on Summit Issues

PM021815 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 First Edition p 5

[Lieutenant Colonel V. Markushin report: "At a Meeting With Journalists"]

[Text] A briefing took place on 28 April in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on current questions of international policy. V.P. Perfilyev, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, who conducted the briefing, drew Soviet and foreign journalists' attention in particular to the fact that it is 1 month until the next summit meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan. How fruitfully will the remaining time be used to ensure a successful meeting in Moscow? This question is of particular importance. The Soviet side is proceeding on the premise that progress must be achieved in this short period with maximum efficiency on the central problem: preparing an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments while not withdrawing from the ABM Treaty for an agreed period.

In the course of their recent talks, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz succeeded in drawing the sides' positions closer on certain important elements linked, in particular, with observance of the ABM Treaty. The talks have reached a point from which further progress is possible. There is no reason for slowing down their progress. At the same time, certain Washington spokesmen can be seen trying to put a damper on the process of achieving an agreement. It would be a sorry affair if anyone were frightened of the success which is quite feasible at this time.

Dwelling on a question linked with settling the situation around Afghanistan, V.P. Perfilyev particularly emphasized the need for a responsible approach from the signatories of the Geneva agreement to ensure the work of the verification and monitoring mechanism, which has, in effect, already been brought into operation. In this connection, the AP report that the United States has airlifted arms shipments to Pakistan, allegedly to compensate for the losses incurred by Islamabad as a result of blowing up munitions dumps, prompts caution.

Journalists' attention was drawn to a BBC African Service report that the USSR is allegedly burying radioactive waste in Benin. This report constitutes an example of disinformation of the first degree. The Soviet Union is not burying radioactive waste in Benin or any other country. At the same time, there is also another report: This has been circulated by France's LA LETTRE DU CONTINENT of 12 April. It concerns, in particular, the fact that radioactive waste has been shipped to Benin by sea from France.

The USSR's positions on other international problems were also explained to journalists, and their questions were answered.

United States & Canada

Reagan Remarks, U.S. Rights Record Condemned

PM0305100788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev: "Of 'Demons' and the President"]

[Text] Enemy Image Collapses [subhead]

It is said that the leaders of the present U.S. Administration like battling against "demons." At any rate, that is the belief of the American writer Michael Rogin, who recently published a book entitled "Ronald Reagan the Movie, and Other Episodes in Political Demonology." The "demons" are sinister enemies of America utterly devoid of human qualities and completely obsessed with the idea of undermining and destroying all that is holy on earth. "In assailing and dehumanizing their opponents," LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE writes in its review of this book, "and foisting on them the framework of a titanic struggle between Good and Evil, the instigators of this 'countersubversive culture' pursue two goals. On the one hand, they legitimize their own ignorance of complex local realities that may emerge on the other side of their 'borders.' And on the other hand, they seek to ensure a domestic consensus, uniting their divided country to struggle against enemies who are depicted as vicious foreigners."

"Demons" have always worked quite well for hardliners in the United States—when it was necessary to "clear" Indians from the land, when repressions were unleashed against workers' leaders who were demanding an 8-hour workday, and at many other stages of U.S. history. Nowadays, the main "evil force" that Washington is quite unable to do without is the Soviet Union, communism, that "cruel and unbending enemy who threatens America with incalculable misfortunes." The bogey painted by extreme right-wing ideologists is extremely handy for anticommunist politicians. It helps them win seats in Congress, sink their political opponents, stifle the discontented voices of the poor, and extort trillions of dollars for military programs. Then all of a sudden—what a shock! The enemy image collapses. Americans and people on other continents are following restructuring in our country with tremendous interest and ever-increasing sympathy. They unambiguously advocate the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations and the consolidation of international security. The advocates of the "demonization" of socialism have reason to panic!

Propaganda Barrage [subhead]

So now an intensive propaganda barrage has begun in Washington. The big guns are opening fire. They are letting loose at our domestic and foreign policy and the very socialist system. The artillery bombardment continues and poisonous smoke drifts around the world, leaving people with a bitter taste in their mouths and disturbing questions.

I have already written about President Reagan's speech at the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Publishers, in which he contrasted the First Amendment to the American Constitution (regarding freedom of speech and the press) with Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution, which proclaims that the CPSU is the leading and directing force of Soviet society. The President tried to cast aspersions on our restructuring and lavished praise on his own country and the American way of life, under which, he claimed, "the pen is mightier than the sword." When you hear such things, you want to ask: Surely the President was not referring to the ups and downs of "Irangate"? Surely not to the actions of the Pentagon and the CIA throughout the world—from Central America to the Near East? There is no trace of the "pen"—that is, of talk, of persuasion—in all this, so to speak, but violence in its worst form is abundantly represented in Washington's policy.

Precisely a week passed, then there were more threadbare cliches and attacks by the head of the U.S. Administration on the Soviet Union and its domestic and foreign policy. This time it is his speech to the Council for International Affairs in Springfield (Massachusetts). Both speeches by the U.S. President are imbued with a spirit of imperial arrogance and verge on interference in our internal affairs. You cannot help wondering: Why are such speeches being delivered at a time when Soviet-American dialogue is developing successfully and particular circumspection in words and deeds and a sense of heightened political responsibility are required from all the participants in that dialogue, especially the two countries' top leaders?

That question is all the more appropriate in that the aforementioned speeches by the President are not the exception but rather the rule in present fashions on the banks of the Potomac. The strident campaign of accusations against socialism, lectures, and attacks has become a permanent factor in the U.S. Administration's political propaganda activity. High-ranking officials and government departments take part in it (recall the recent State Department report on human rights, which defames our country, and the subsequent USIA report portraying the foreign policy activity of Soviet public organizations as "subversive" and aimed at "misleading gullible people in the West"). And in its broadcasts to the Soviet Union the government radio station Voice of America continually takes liberties—to put it mildly—that can only be described as incitement to anti-Soviet actions.

It is striking that, whereas Western abusers of socialism used to concentrate more on certain aspects of our life or, to be more accurate, on the way they saw it—the fate of "dissidents," questions of emigration from the USSR,

and so forth—the very foundations are now under fire. The main target of the propaganda barrage today is our political and social system as such.

Why? Why this adjustment of ideological sights? I think that all this is a response to our restructuring. The expansion of socialist democracy and glasnost and the honest, direct discussion of our affairs that has developed in our country deprive the anti-Sovietists of their old, well-proven trump cards. They too are having to "restructure." Unfortunately the change is for the worse.

Who Are the Judges? [subhead]

If those who do not share "American values" are "demons," their apologists are, naturally, "knights in shining armor." It is also in the traditions of official America to see itself in a most rosy light. There is no limit to self-glorification when the talk turns to U.S. national experience and U.S. practices. It is here that reference is made to the nation's "founding fathers"—those virtuous and wise men in powdered wigs declaiming the lines of the Declaration of Independence: "All men are created equal, they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness...."

"All men are created equal...." Perhaps the reader-declaimers have heard nothing about the position of millions of black-skinned and dark-complexioned Americans? Today, 20 years after the death of Martin Luther King, racial discrimination in the economic sphere is hitting still more pitilessly those who had the misfortune to be born with a "second-class" pigmentation to their skin. The black family's average income is 57 percent of the white family's, the level of unemployment among negroes is 150 percent higher than among their paleface colleagues, and 40 percent of young black men and women have been forced into the category of "superfluous people."

"The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness...." What an insult these words sound for the 35 million American poor, approximately 7 million unemployed, 2-3 million homeless, and hundreds of thousands of Indians eking out a miserable existence on reservations. America is rich. But in terms of social protection for its citizens, the United States is inferior to many countries with a far more modest volume of industrial and agricultural production.

And, finally, the civil and political liberties about which Washington propagandists say so much, presenting the United States as a model to be emulated by all peoples. Yes, the United States is a bourgeois-democratic country. Its social and political life is characterized by variety and a multitude of voices. But you have only to look more closely to notice that, although the orchestra of public sentiment appears to have no leader, there is a very efficient conductor taking it in the required direction. He not only shapes public sentiment, but also keeps a vigilant eye on "dissidents" and "neutralizes" the most dangerous of them in time. The vast apparatus of U.S. internal espionage is a well-known phenomenon. The years after Watergate and the U.S. defeat in Vietnam, when America indulged in soul-searching, slightly raised the curtain on the activities of the FBI, the CIA, and other subdivisions of the "intelligence community," and soul-chilling pictures of investigation, surveillance, provocation, and incitement to violence against progressive figures opened up before shocked Americans.

Officially, there are no political prisoners in the United States. But what about Leonard Peltier, John Harris, Dennis Banks, Geronimo Pratt, and many other Negro and Indian leaders, brave fighters for their compatriots' rights, who have been thrown into jails on trumped-up charges?

Cruelty permeates individual articles of U.S. legislation and the practice of U.S. courts and the police. In a number of the country's states, even minors are sentenced to death for crimes. (A list containing the names of 32 under-age Americans awaiting death from bullets, in the electric chair, or in the gas chamber was handed to the U.S. deputy secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian affairs in Moscow at the end of last year). Judicial and police arbitrariness in the United States is thickly mixed with racism. Suffice it to say that of the more than 1,500 people awaiting the implementation of the death sentence in America, 42 percent are Negroes, although blacks make up just 12 percent of the country's population.

And a person's right to leave and enter the country, which transatlantic politicians hotly demand of others—is Washington itself so faithful to it? The entrance doors to the United States are systematically slammed shut on those who are considered undesirable aliens. According to the U.S. journal BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, the State Department's electronic file contains the names of approximately 2 million people who are banned from entering the United States. Frequently for ideological reasons. The U.S. Administration still uses the shameful McCarran-Walter Act, a legacy from the dark years of McCarthyism, which prohibits entry to the country for "communists, Marxists, and persons linked with groups which preach such convictions." Those who have been denied the right to step onto American soil include Hortensia Bussi de Allende, widow of the assassinated president of Chile; Gabriel Garcia Marquez, the Colombian writer and Nobel Prize winner; Bernadette Devlin, former British member of parliament; and many others.

Responsibility to the World [subhead]

No, it is no accident that the United States has such an unsightly record in the sphere of international law: It has ratified only 6 of the 22 most important international documents on human rights.

Nor is it any accident that, while trampling political, civil, and socioeconomic rights at home, the U.S. Administration is "exporting" these morals abroad. Is the U.S. state terrorism with regard to Nicaragua, the crude diktat with regard to Panama, and the dangerous militarist actions in the Persian Gulf not the continuation of this internal American policy? Does Washington's support for the repressive regimes in Chile, El Salvador, and Israel not attest to a kinship of souls between the "fighters for rights" and the butchers?

We are once again being censured, lectured, and "set on the right path." Those who would look around should ponder and tackle their own affairs. To tell the truth, this is not the first time this has happened. In the past, the castigation of the Soviet Union "as a violator of human rights" fulfilled various internal and foreign policy functions in the United States: It appeased right-wingers, served as a kind of anesthetic compress for the country's social sores, and helped to unite the Western allies. What is new this time is that they are now raining down crude ideological attacks on us at a time when a dialogue that is important for the whole world is successfully developing between the USSR and the United States and when both sides seemed to have begun taking a more realistic approach to each other and freeing themselves of attempts to impose their views on each other. A natural question: Why is this being done, and who needs it?

U.S. newspapers are now writing a great deal about the election campaign that is getting under way in the United States and pointing out that at such times, politicians' usual reflexes work particularly frequently, and there is a growing temptation to "flex muscles." But, you know, there is also responsibility to the world and to one's own people. Washington's confrontational line oriented toward interference in our internal affairs is fanning the flames of ideological bitterness and having a negative effect on the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. Mankind cannot be allowed to pander to ideological extremism and politicking and miss the historic chance which it has now gained to take practical steps toward a secure, nuclear-free world.

Shultz Talks 'Improved' Treaty Prospects

LD301331 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] We are inviting you to another dialogue. We are now in the 2d week following the talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in Moscow. The results of the talks continue to be the subject of broad comment in the world and it is above all the prospects for the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons which are the subject of wide-ranging debates. Also, will the agenda be ready for the coming Soviet-U.S. summit scheduled to be held in Moscow between 29 May and 2 June? Listen now to what Viktor Glazunov, a Moscow Radio political correspondent, thinks about it all.

[Glazunov in Russian fading into Slovak translation] To tell the truth, I was very surprised when many of my colleagues began to display pessimism following the talks held in Moscow between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz. Tom Brokaw of the U.S. NBC television network has said that the treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic weapons was not likely to be signed at the coming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The chances have now been lost, was the more categorical view of London's THE TIMES.

I do not want to assert with certainty that the treaty will be signed in Moscow. What I do not, however, like in the categorical pessimism is that it proceeds from the conclusions reached at the meeting in Moscow between Shevardnadze and Shultz. The impression has been created that the talks were almost a fiasco as far as the strategic weapons are concerned. The well-known U.S. journalists, (Barry Lee) and Don Oberdorfer, wrote in THE WASHINGTON TIMES: The prospects for the signing of a historic Soviet-U.S. strategic arms treaty at the summit meeting in Moscow, which were not great previously, are today even lesser.

It is true that the talks between Shevardnadze and Shultz did not achieve a breakthrough; they did not bring about a solution in the still unresolved issues, but I believe that not only did they not worsen the prospects but on the contrary they improved them. As Eduard Shevardnadze said, a certain stage and further practical progress were achieved in Moscow in the talks on strategic weapons. We have reached a stage from which we can make rapid progress.

These are words—I am sure you will agree with me—which do not give any reason for a pessimistic mood. Both sides confirmed during the talks their firm obligation to make an active effort to bring the work on the treaty to reduce strategic weapons, and all documents linked with it, to a successful conclusion in the shortest possible time. George Shultz was told that Moscow still favors completing the preparation of the relevant documents before President Ronald Reagan's arrival in the Soviet Union.

For me personally, the chief indicator is the issue of the observance of the ABM Treaty. There has been a progress in this issue. After the Moscow meeting, both countries' foreign ministers instructed their respective delegations at the Geneva talks to prepare a joint draft of the text of the treaty on the basis of the so called Washington formulas. These formulas reckon on a 50-percent reduction in strategic weapons coupled with adherence to the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, and with the nonviolation of this treaty during the agreed period. The joint draft of this treaty is to be ready by the time Shevardnadze and Shultz meet next time, scheduled for between 11 and 12 May in Geneva. If the ministers did not have any hope of succeeding they would hardly have given such a task to their diplomats.

Of course, the still unresolved issues of air- and sea-launched cruise missiles are important. Undoubtedly, by their significance they have, however, taken a step back on the ABM Treaty. This, in my view, is the fundamental issue of the entire problem concerning the reduction of strategic arms. If we are frank, the difficulties regarding the cruise missiles are not so big. To be frank, I am rather surprised by the U.S. side's effort to maintain a certain reserve here and to retain certain possibilities to avoid the levels to be consolidated in the treaty. Why? After all, both countries today possess a strategic potential which enables each of them to destroy the other at least 10 times, and not only to destroy each other but to destroy every living thing on earth. If we reduce by half this horrible possibility, then why engage in maneuvering and why hide anything at all? After all, the existing possibility of a fivefold mutual destruction is more than sufficient. It is necessary to think about further reductions and not about compensatory steps about which there is talk today. Naturally, we are aware of the difficulties along the road to the preparation of the strategic arms treaty. There is little time remaining before the next summit meeting—less than a month. I would, however, like to recall experiences from the treaty on shorter- and intermediate-range missiles. Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz, after all, found mutually acceptable solutions to the exacting issues literally 2 weeks before the treaty was signed. Ahead of us still is another meeting between the two ministers. It will take place 2 and 1/2 weeks before the summit meeting.

Some people have asked me whether contentious issues can be resolved in just over 4 weeks when 4 months have been lost. Why these 4 months have been wasted since the meeting in Washington, when work was going on and progress was being made, albeit not at such a pace as we would desire? But hard and ostensibly invisible work nonetheless helps the decison to mature. We shall not rush to draw definite conclusions about the prospects for signing the strategic arms treaty. Even if it is not signed at the next summit, there is no need to make a tragedy of it. It would not be right to define the matter in such a way. The Geneva accords on the political settlements of the Afghan situation were still not signed by 15 March. They were, however, signed after the lapse of another month. I do not exclude that the treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic arms, coupled with observation of the ABM Treaty, can be signed at the coming summit meeting. If the draft of the document will not be ready by that time even then the meeting will be an impulse to complete the work on the treaty at the shortest time possible.

U.S.-Soviet Memorandum on Reactor Safety Signed

LD030617 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Washington May 3—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Orekhov:

The seventh meeting of the joint Soviet-American Commission for Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy ended here on Monday.

"The Soviet delegation came for that meeting determined to give a fresh impetus to the cooperation of Soviet and American scientists and technicians in the field of atomic energy and nuclear power engineering," Aleksandr Protsenko, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Uses of Atomic Energy, told the press conference at the U.S. State Department. This field of cooperation covers an area from research into the fundamental properties of matter to the development and creation of new, even more perfect energy sources. Our discussions and the tour of the country were highly useful."

In the course of the Washington talks a Soviet-American memorandum was signed on cooperation in safeguards at civil nuclear reactors, reports were heard on the course of joint research projects.

During the stay in the USA the Soviet delegation visited the nuclear power station in Calvert Cliffs, Maryland, the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory and the General Atomics Company, California.

U.S. Plans To Increase Arms Shipments Abroad

Confidential Report Revealed

LD021205 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] New York May 2 TASS—The Reagan administration intends to considerably increase arms deliveries abroad this year. This has become known to today's newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES which has at its disposal a copy of the confidential report of the Department of State to Congress. The total cost of such deliveries is to exceed 15,000 million dollars, a rise of 3,300 million dollars over the past year.

In the report there is a list of potential deals with 33 states. The U.S. ally in the Middle East, Israel, will remain the main receiver of weapons—3,600 million dollars. Over 3,000 million dollars are allocated to South Korea on the territory of which a 40,000 strong U.S. corps is deployed.

Implementation of Washington's plans will even more heighten the situation in the Persian Gulf since the administration has requested approval of sales of up-to-date weapons and equipment to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates.

'Expanding' Shipments Criticized

LD021914 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 2 May 88

[Leonid Rassadin commentary]

[Excerpts] On obtaining a copy of a State Department confidential report to Congress, THE NEW YORK TIMES has revealed the administration's intention of notably expanding arms shipments to other countries. [passage omitted] Radio Moscow's Leonid Rassadin comments:

Munitions supplies abroad are a sure indicator of a country's political course. It's no secret the Soviet Union, too, sells weapons to other countries, including developing nations such as Syria, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and Ethiopia. But one point should be emphasized in this connection: Soviet munitions supplies are not only addressed to lawful governments but are also aimed at supporting nations fighting for their freedom and independence, their social and economic gains, and their lawful right to self-determination. As for American military assistance, among its main recipients are such countries as Israel, South Korea, and Pakistan. [passage omitted]

One cannot but feel concerned about the United States' intention of drastically increasing the secret flow of weapons to the antigovernment armed groups in Afghanistan. The question logically arises as to how this is to be viewed in the context of the Geneva accords in Afghanistan, under which the United States is one of the guarantors of no external interference in that country's domestic affairs.

As I drove along one of Moscow's central avenues, writes commentator Leonid Rassadin, I paid attention to a large stand erected on May Day's eve. In its upper part, one can see two flags, the Soviet and American. Under them there is a drawing of a missile, criss-crossed by two lines. The words below read: Disarmament is the demand of the times. After the Soviet-American treaty was signed to scrap intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the world began hoping for the better. In present day international policy, making one should abandon the practice of weapons storage or proliferation and take the historic chance of insuring onward movement along the path of disarmament. [sentence as heard]

U.S. Administration, Congress Differ on SDI

PM291545 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 First Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Debate in Congress"]

[Text] Washington, 28 Apr—When arguments are ridiculous, people in America say they "do not hold water." This expression was particularly in vogue in the U.S. House of Representatives today. Many legislators applied this description to the stance taken by those who are obstinately "undermining" the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty.

By 252 votes to 159 the House advocated a ban on any tests under the "Star Wars" program in the next fiscal year which run counter to the provisions of the treaty originally agreed by the two sides.

It is no coincidence that the question of the need for strict compliance with this fundamental agreement in the arms control sphere is being raised here, nor is this the first time. Pushed by the military-industrial complex via the Pentagon, the administration is insisting on the "right" to freely interpret the pledges adopted by the United States on preventing the militarization of space. No matter in what demagogic garb the White House dresses up its attempt on the treaty's principles or how it maneuvers, it is obvious that its revision will open the sluice gates for the spread of the arms race into space. The outcome of the House of Representatives vote has confirmed the awareness of this fact and of the full seriousness and unpredictability of the consequences. The attempts by the SDI "pushers" to speculate on the upcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting in Moscow proved, for the most part, groundless.

The different approaches to arms control between congressmen and the administration were also recorded in another decision, also adopted today. As last year, the lower house of Congress banned the allocation of any funds for the creation [sozdaniye] or purchase of arms which would mean exceeding the quantitative limits laid down in the SALT II Treaty. That accord was derailed when Washington announced unilaterally in 1986 that it did not consider itself bound by its provisions. Although SALT II fell victim to narrow mercenary politicking and was not ratified, its wrecking was never approved on Capitol Hill. Reflecting the widespread opinion, L. Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, stated: Compliance with the SALT II ceilings would meet U.S. interests.

Bill Banning Space Weapons Introduced in Senate

LD301546 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 30 TASS—A bill banning the development, testing, production and deployment of any space arms as well as the testing of anti-satellite weapons provided the Soviet Union acts similarly has been submitted to the U.S. Senate for consideration.

The introduction of the bill was announced at a press conference on Friday by Senator Tom Harkin (Democrat, Iowa). He said the bill was aimed at ensuring peaceful uses of outer space for the benefit of all the peoples on earth. Unlimited possibilities for scientific experiments, research and industrial activities in open

space conditions would open up before mankind in future, Mr Harkin said. However, that would happen only provided weapons are not deployed in outer space.

A similar bill was submitted for consideration to the U.S. House of Representatives by Congressman Les AuCoin (Democrat, Arizona). [state designation as received]

Poll Shows Most Americans Support INF Treaty

LD301112 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 29 TASS—A public opinion poll has shown that most of Americans favour the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and the working out of a Soviet-American agreement on strategic arms reduction. The information about this public opinion survey held by Martilla and Kiley firm in the framework of the Project American on security matters was announced at a press conference in the National Press Club on Thursday.

Four of every five people polled favour the working out of an agreement on strategic arms, says a report summing up the poll. More than half of the poll firmly support the agreement. The overwhelming majority of the Americans do not believe that a sharp reduction in strategic arms is too risky and will jeopardize national security. Quite the contrary, they emphasized that mutual reduction in armaments will make the world safer and strengthen national security. The poll also showed that in the opinion of 61 percent of its participants the relations between the USA and the USSR are improving. One of the organisers of the poll, John Martilla, assessed these data as a striking change. He recalled that back in 1986, according to the gallup survey, only 24 percent of the poll believed that the U.S.-Soviet relations were improving.

At the same time, the Americans on the whole remain sceptical with regard to the USSR, says the report.

Senators Press Greece To Keep U.S. Bases

LD030940 Moscow TASS in English 0917 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Athens May 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Malyshev:

Washington is ever more persistently pressing ahead for progress at the Greek-U.S. talks on the future of the U.S. bases in Greece. This is seen from the talks held here between a group of American senators led by Senate Republican minority leader Robert Dole. They met with Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou and other Greek leaders.

The talks centered on Greek-American cooperation in the field of defense, in particular, the question of the bases, the situation on NATO's south eastern flank and the problem of Greek-Turkish relations closely linked with it. The same questions were discussed in the course of the recent visit of another high-ranking overseas visitor—Rozanne Ridgway, U.S. assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs.

It is not accidental that Washington is devoting increasing attention to Greece. Late this year the term expires of the treaty, within whose framework the U.S. military facilities are deployed in the country's territory. According to the treaty adopted in 1983, the U.S. bases are to be withdrawn from Greece after the five-year term expires. Yet Washington persists in its efforts to ensure that they be left where they are. The talks on that subject opened late last year, but have so far not brought about any results. As the local press notes, the American visitors frequenting Athens are trying to bring pressure to bear on the Greek Government to ensure a decision advantageous to them.

The democratic public of Greece resolutely declares for the dismantling of the U.S. bases in the territory of Greece. This is seen from the May-Day demonstrations held in many cities of the country, whose participants carried posters saying "Take Out the U.S. Bases", "End Talks With Washington."

Reagan Receives Finnish Prime Minister

LD030726 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Washington May 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin:

President Reagan met Monday at the White House with [Finnish] Prime Minister Harri Holkeri.

Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the President for press relations, said after the meeting that it had disucssed bilateral relations as well as the forthcoming Moscow summit between the U.S. President and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan's visit to Helsinki on his way to the Soviet capital.

Fitzwater in a written statement quoted Reagan as telling Holkeri that the U.S.-Soviet relationship had made progress and expressing gratitude to Finland for supporting that policy.

The U.S. President was also quoted as saying that the Helsinki Final Act symbolized latest efforts to overcome Europe's split into East and West and to strengthen security and cooperation.

Reagan Extends Sanctions Against Nicaragua

LD021452 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] Washington May 2 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

Three years ago President Reagan announced the introduction of all-round embargo on trade with Nicaragua. The measure, bound to back up military pressure on the Sandinistas, was attributed to "extraordinary threat to national security and foreign policy of the United States", which, as the White House asserts, continues coming from Nicaragua.

A few days ago the U.S. President under the same pretext prolonged for yet another time the operation of economic sanctions, reaffirming that the White House does not intend to change its policy vis-a-vis Nicaragua. But in the past three years the situation in the region, which was turned by the United States, as the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST put it, into a laboratory of testing tactics of struggle against Marxist governments through the hands of mercenaries, has changed.

The explosive events in Central America: a state close to civil war in Panama, the sending of American troops to Honduras, the unexpectedly achieved agreement on ceasefire in Nicaragua and the growing guerrilla movement in El Salvador, the newspaper THE LOS ANGELES TIMES writes—all that reaffirms that the nation might pay a huge price for the misleading foreign policy based on lies and illusions. The pressure being exerted by the United States might delay the current changes, but it cannot stop them, the newspaper stressed. In the White House they cannot understand, as before, this obvious truth.

U.S. House Votes Against Nicaragua Invasion

LD030609 Moscow TASS in English 0606 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Washington May 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy:

The U.S. House of Representatives has approved by 276 votes against 92 the ban on the use of the U.S. Armed Forces against Nicaragua. The ban was adopted as an amendment to the U.S. military budget for the fiscal year 1989 beginning on October 1 this year.

The House of Representatives has already passed similar amendments twice—in 1987 and 1986, but they did not win a sufficient number of votes in the Senate, the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress. Hence in the course of drafting a compromise version of the military budget bill at the House-Senate Conference Committee, the amendments lost their mandatory force, assuming the character of "recommendations" by the law-makers.

The Reagan administration declares that no bans or recommendations are necessary since it has no plans to use the U.S. Armed Forces against Nicaragua and since the U.S. servicemen in Honduras are not allowed to come to the Nicaraguan border closer than to a distance of 20 miles. Meanwhile, during the recent military exercises in Honduras started against the background of the claims made by the United States that Nicaraguan units allegedly invaded the Honduran territory, the U.S. troops approached the Nicaraguan borders almost closely. [sentence as received]

Dobrynin Received Riggs Bank Board Chairman

PM011251 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Businessman Received"]

[Text] On 28 April A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received J.L. Allbritton, chairman of the board of Riggs National Bank, a leading Washington bank.

Questions of Soviet-U.S. relations and new forms of financial and economic cooperation between the two countries were touched on during the talks. J. Allbritton noted the great potential for mutually advantageous business ties stemming from the policy of restructuring being implemented in the Soviet Union.

China

Commentary Hails PRC Trade Union Contacts

OW0205130788 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Dear Chinese audience: Now, I will continue to talk about matters related to 1 May. As we, the Soviets, recall, there is another reason for the importance of this day to the Chinese working people: The All-China Federation of Trade Unions was founded on 1 May 1925, 63 years ago. That is, the day of international unity of the working people of all countries is also the birthday of the Chinese Federation of Trade Unions. This, I believe, is of profound symbolic meaning. Our station commentator has the following to say on this subject:

China's trade unions contributed a brilliant chapter to the history of the national and social liberation struggles carried out by the Chinese working class. It is noteworthy that at the very inception, the Chinese Federation of Trade Unions established closed ties with its Soviet counterpart. The Soviet Trade Union actively supported the Chinese workers' struggle for national and social liberation. It was based on the Soviet Trade Union's proposal that an association for prohibiting intervention in China's internal affairs was established in our country when imperialists were making all-out efforts at such intervention. The period of the Great Revolution in China from 1925 to 1927 witnessed the beginning of the tradition of brotherly mutual support between the Soviet and Chinese trade unions. Then, with the founding of the People's Republic of China, a new stage of cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese trade unions began. In a brotherly manner, the Soviet working class imparted to

its Chinese counterpart the experience in socialist construction, and numerous trade union delegations were dispatched to visit each other.

It is a pleasure to point out that after a certain period of estrangement, the Soviet and Chinese trade unions resumed contacts recently. Delegations have been exchanged between the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the All-China Federation of Trade Unions. Some industries of the two countries have also sent delegations to visit each other. In addition, an agreement has been reached on periodic visits of trade union delegations to each other, the expansion of contacts in social activities and in the field of science and technology, and the exchange of experience gained by the trade unions of the two countries in working under conditions of economic reform and innovation. All these are to the advantage of both the Soviet Union and China and conform to the traditional friendship and the spirit of unity between the Soviet and Chinese working people.

Qian Qichen Comments on International Relations

LD011329 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Beijing May 1 TASS—China will continue promoting world peace and development. We shall direct our efforts at stopping the arms race, and see to it that regional conflicts be solved in a reasonable way, said Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China Qian Qichen in the first interview after his appointment to the post, printed in the Chinese weekly LIAOWANG.

The People's Republic of China intends to continue developing broad trade-and-economic, scientific-and-technological, and cultural cooperation with different states to promote socialist modernization which is under way in the country, he said.

Touching upon the coming Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow, the Chinese foreign minister said that, in China's opinion, "both sides need to maintain the dialogue and to attain results".

The Chinese foreign minister noted the progress attained in the Chinese-American relations. But the Taiwan problem is as before an obstacle to the development of contacts, he added. In the United States there were repeated cases of interference in China's internal affairs, which were insulting to the feelings of the Chinese people. Chinese-American relations may continue developing in the future only if both sides strictly abide by the principles enshrined in bilateral documents, Qian Qichen underlined. The development of China's relations with Japan is on the whole marked with an onward trend, but "new problems arose in the recent years", he said.

China To Reduce Machinery, Equipment Imports

LD301143 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] Beijing April 29 TASS—The import of 100 kinds of machinery will shortly be reduced by China. A list of imported machinery and equipment is being reviewed in accordance with a government decision. The purchases of mini-buses and air conditioners are, for instance, to be decreased.

The purpose of the curtailment of the import of machinery is to ensure greater competiveness of such products of Chinese make in the home market, said a spokesman for the Ministry of the Machine-Building and Electronic Industries of the PRC. It is planned that as a result of these measures the state will be able to save 270 million dollars this year.

Because of the shortage of convertible currency, China has already taken a number of steps to reduce imports, the newspaper CHINA DAILY writes today. In the past year the volume of import dropped by 200 million dollars on the previous year.

Northeast Asia

Maj Gen Markelov Criticizes 'Team Spirit'

SK2904051588 Pyongyang KCNA in English 0504 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 27 (KCNA)—Major General Yuri Markelov, deputy director of a department of the General Staff of the Soviet Army, in an interview with the KCNA correspondent in Moscow disclosed the aggressive purpose and character of the "Team Spirit" joint manoeuvres.

He said the "Team Spirit 88" being staged by the United States and the South Korean puppets is a provocative and criminal aggressive war manoeuvre which opposes the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and is wrecking peace and security on the Korean peninsula.

Referring to the fact that the United States and South Korea staged the "Team Spirit" joint manoeuvres on the Korean peninsula from long ago, he continued:

South Korea has been completely converted into a logistic base and nuclear arsenal of the United States to invade the DPRK, the Soviet Union and other Asian countries.

The "Team Spirit" is a war game and test nuclear war manoeuvre to invade the DPRK and the Soviet Union.

The exercises are the root cause which renders the situation in the Far Eastern area of the Soviet Union to an extreme pitch of strain, to say nothing of the Korean peninsula, and tramples underfoot peace in Korea and Asia.

Worse still, the United States and the South Korean authorities are claiming that the manoeuvres are aimed to "ensure the Olympics".

He stressed:

The Soviet people strongly oppose the "Team Spirit 88" joint manouevres and demand the United States and the South Korean puppet regime to stop the provocative military action on the Korean peninsula.

The Soviet Union considers that only when such an aggressive military action, conflict and cold war are completely terminated in the life of humanity is it possible to ensure peace and security.

DPRK's Kim Yong-nam Visits Soviet Union

Meets With Shevardnadze

SK0305041988 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Commentary by station commentator Yegor Levechev]

[Text] Comrade Kim Yong-nam, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea [WPK], vice premier of the State Administration Council of the DPRK, and foreign minister of the Republic, is now staying in our country. He came to the Soviet Union for an official goodwill visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

It is not the first or second time that Comrade Kim Yong-nam has visited our country. Every one of his visits to our country has served as a remarkable milestone in strengthening the friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

In his talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Comrade Eduard Shevardnadze during his current visit, views on the fundamental issues over the development of the world commonly shared by the two countries were expressed. Also expressed in the talks are the two countries' desire to further consummate cohesion and unity and the unbreakable friendly ties between the two peoples and two parties of the two fraternal countries based on the principle of Marxism-Leninism and (?Proletarian) Internationalism.

In their talks, the Soviet and DPRK foreign ministers discussed many political and economic and other issues and even some important international issues as well.

Foreign Ministers Eduard Shevardnadze and Kim Yong-nam noted the need to put into practice foreign policy lines agreed and coordinated between the two countries with a view toward further consolidating peace and security on earth in the future.

Now, what issues were discussed in detail at the talks?

After intensely examining the economic relations between the two countries, the two sides expressed satisfaction over the fact that USSR-DPRK cooperation is developing on a full scope in a way that corresponds to the agreement reached at the meeting between Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev and Comrade Kim Il-song in October 1986 in Moscow.

The Korean side expressed its support for the constructive attitude adopted by the Soviet Union in connection with the guarantee of peace and security—a life-and-death matter for mankind.

Noting the historical significance of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on abolishing intermediate-range missiles, Comrade Kim Yong-nam expressed his hope that an agreement on the fundamental reduction of offensive-nature strategic weapons would be reached at the Soviet-U.S. summit talks to be held in Moscow.

The DPRK is a country in Asia. A large part of the territory of the Soviet Union stretches to the Asian land. Therefore, the foreign ministers of the two countries paid keen attention to the analysis of the situation in Asia and the Pacific.

The two ministers stressed that the two countries will continue to cooperate mutually to consolidate the security of the Soviet Union and the DPRK and to promote equal cooperation among the countries in the region.

Comrade Kim Yong-nam stated that the DPRK supports the Soviet Union's Vladivostok proposals.

The very important Korean person [kwibin] explained in detail the measures taken by the Republic with a view toward easing tension on the Korean peninsula and toward promoting national reconciliation between the North and South of Korea.

In the meantime, Comrade Eduard Shevardnadze stated that the Soviet Union supports such proposals.

Saying that the Soviet Union emphasizes that the North and South of Korea conduct constructive dialogue, Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said that it is very important to start dialogue toward this end. He said that this can be begun by restoring contacts at all levels, ranging from [word indistinct] to [word indistinct], with a view toward creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust, in the form of talks between the vast social circles and representatives of the authorities in the North and South.

The Soviet foreign minister once again stated the Soviet Union's invariable solidarity with the lines of the WPK and the DPRK directed toward the peaceful settlement of the Korean questions without any kind of foreign intervention.

Comrade Kim Yong-nam's visit to the Soviet Union is continuing successfully.

The goals the two countries have in common and their faithfulness toward peace and socialist ideals make the mutual economic ties between the two fraternal countries develop, make them appear in cohesion and unity in the international stage, and strengthen the (?socialist alliance), the major source of strength and might of global socialism in the struggle for peace and social progress.

Attends Belorussian Festival

LD011809 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Having arrived in Minsk yesterday evening, Kim Yong-nam, Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo member, deputy premier of the Administrative Council, and DPRK minister of foreign affairs, was present today at festive demonstrations by representatives of the city's working people.

A conversation also took place today between Comrade Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, and Kim Yong-nam. The guest was told about the processes of restructuring taking place in the Belorussian SSR and throughout the country, and of the democratization of social life. The conversation was held in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

Holds Talks in Minsk

LD021354 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] Kim Yong-nam, member of the Korean Workers' Party Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council, and minister of foreign affairs, had a meeting today in Minsk at the Belorussian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The guest also visited the Memorial Museum of the First Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party and the State Museum.

Cooperation Commission Meeting Held With DPRK

Murakhovskiy Attends Talks

PM021255 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading: "Support for USSR Policy"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 28 Apr—The routine, 22d session of the Soviet-Korean Intergovernmental Consultative Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Questions was held in the DPRK capital on 25-28 April. The Soviet delegation was headed by V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Korean delegation by Kim Pok-sin, candidate member of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council.

A wide range of questions of economic cooperation was examined in light of the accords reached between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and president of the DPRK, in Moscow in October 1986.

Japanese Ambassador Addresses Soviet Public

LD292328 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 29 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; National Day address by Japanese Ambassador Toshiaki Muto in Japanese with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] Esteemed viewers! I am very glad that today I can greet the entire Soviet people in my capacity as Japanese ambassador in the USSR. Japan and the Soviet Union have close links, both historically and geographically. Our bilateral relations have a huge potential in both political and economic aspects. Their development answers the interests of both countries and also contributes greatly to the cause of peace and stability in the Asian-Pacific region. It is important that the two sides should make joint efforts for the balanced development of our bilateral relations on the basis of mutual respect and benefit. From our side, our country will spare no effort in this direction.

Fortunately for us, Japanese-Soviet relations have acquired successful and progressive development in the trade and economic, scientific, cultural, and many other spheres. Among the latest instances, an agreement on cultural links was ratified and an information section at the Japanese Embassy was opened last December. Thus, a foundation for expanding cultural links was laid down. In the economic sphere, a joint session of the Japanese-Soviet and Soviet-Japanese committees for economic cooperation was held last January with great success.

The results of recent opinion polls conducted in the USSR and Japan showed that the peoples of both countries sincerely wish to deepen mutual understanding. I am confident that further deepening and expanding such mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries will contribute, eventually, to a healthy development of our interstate relations.

Of course, dialogue plays a great role in developing mutual understanding. Two years ago, an exchange of visits between the Japanese and Soviet ministers of foreign affairs took place. The ministers discussed the issues of Japanese-Soviet relations and international problems of mutual interest, thereby restoring political dialogue between the two countries. At that time, the

talks related to the conclusion of the Japanese-Soviet peace treaty were conducted at foreign minister level, and an accord on continuing them was attained.

Profiting by this occasion, I would like to stress again that both countries must strive together and in the most serious manner to fulfill the main task: concluding a peace treaty after the issue of the northern territories has been resolved, an issue that has remained one of the greatest unresolved issues between us after the war, and thereby establishing stable relations based on true mutual understanding between our two countries. For our part, we sincerely hope that this year, in accordance with the accord attained, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze will visit Japan, and that another consultation at foreign minister level will take place, and that political dialogue between Japan and the Soviet Union will see further progress on this basis.

In conclusion, I would like, on behalf of the Japanese Government and the Japanese people, to wish you all good health, great happiness, and prosperity. Thank you for your attention.

'Hoppo Ryodo' Situation Noted

OW3004052088 Tokyo KYODO in English 0507 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, April 30 KYODO—Toshiaki Muto, Japanese ambassador to the Soviet Union, reiterated Friday that the solution to the "Hoppo Ryodo (northern territory)" issue is a key to improving relations between the two countries.

In a speech to the Soviet public in an annual television broadcast on Emperor Hirohito's birthday, Muto was the first Japanese ambassador to use the native phrase reference to four northern islands off eastern Hokkaido now occupied by the Soviet Union.

However, Soviet television translated the word, "hoppo ryodo," directly into Russian, instead of censoring it.

The Soviet TV censored the Russian version of the previous televised message on the emperor's birthday by then Ambassador Yasue Katori. Katori intended to say to "solve the issue which has been put under continuous negotiations," but it was translated into Russian as to discuss the problem.

Pointing to the importance of continued talks between the two countries to promote mutual understanding, Muto also expressed hope in the televised message that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze would visit Japan by the end of this year to hold the regular bilateral foreign minister's meeting.

Soviet-Japanese Fishery Committee Session Opens

Japanese Quota To Be Cut

OW3004040688 Tokyo KYODO in English 0346 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, April 29 KYODO—Japan's overall fish catch quota off Soviet waters in the northern Pacific will be slashed 15 percent in 1988 as part of a new bilateral fishing agreement to be signed in Moscow on Saturday.

Japanese officials said the accord reached in difficult talks at the fourth session of the Japan-Soviet Joint Fishery Committee requires Japan to reduce its official fishing haul in Soviet waters to 20,826 tons, down from 24,500 tons allowed in the 1987 season.

Despite the cut, the actual size of Japan's 1988 fish haul will be roughly equivalent to last year's catch, since Japanese fishermen usually fulfill somewhere around 80 percent of their quota, according to industry observers.

The two sides, however, remain at odds over a Soviet demand for an end to Japanese salmon fishing on the open sea by 1992.

Kenichi Unno, head of the Fisheries Agency's Oceanic Fisheries Department and Japan's chief delegate to the talks, said the latest accord "was an extremely serious result, considering Japan's future."

The Soviets also refused Japan's request for "substitute" waters in the Soviet fishing zone should U.S. courts ban mothership fishing in so-called "third waters" within the 200-mile U.S. economic zone, Japanese officials said.

Greater flexibility was shown by the Soviets regarding a reduction in Japan's contribution to a fishery cooperation fund designed to promote the Soviet's fishing industry.

Under the new accord, Japan will contribute 3.7 billion yen to the fund, the same as last year's figure, and negotiations will continue on proportionate reductions if the two sides ultimately agree to a salmon fishing ban in the open sea, they said.

Fisheries Agency Director General Hirohisa Tanaka said Japan's compromise in the talks was "inevitable," but was adamant regarding Japan's opposition to a ban on salmon fishing in the open sea.

Salmon Catch Protocol Signed

OW0105062288 Tokyo KYODO in English 0524 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 1 KYODO—Japan and the Soviet Union signed a protocol here Saturday on this year's salmon catch in the northern waters.

Japan's catch quota is 20,826 tons, about 15 percent less than last year's 24,500 tons.

The amount of "fishery cooperation funds" Japan pays to the Soviets is 3.7 billion yen, unchanged from last year.

At the outset of the Japan-Soviet salmon negotiations at Tokyo, the Soviet side proposed a total ban on salmon fishing in the open seas by 1992, resulting in a standstill.

The negotiations were suspended in March and the latest round was resumed in Moscow on April 25.

UN Law of Sea Convention Cited

LD010055 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1914 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 30 Apr (TASS)—Soviet-Japanese consultations ended in Moscow today on the procedure and conditions for salmon fishing by Japan in the northwestern part of the Pacific Ocean that are spawning in the rivers of the Soviet Far East. With respect to species of fish which have river and sea cycles of development, not only are the preferential rights of the state of origin set down in the UN convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 with regard to the exploitation of these bioresources, but also the responsibility for their state and preservation throughout the whole of the migratory path.

Zilanov Remarks on Conclusion

OW0305115588 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] USSR-Japan negotiations on salmon fishing concluded at the Soviet Ministry of Fish Industry in Moscow on 30 April. The consultations were for determining terms and operating rules for Japanese fishing in the Northwestern Pacific of salmon that have spawned in the rivers of the Soviet Far East. The session was the continuation of the fourth joint meeting of the USSR-Japan and Japan-USSR fisheries committees held in Tokyo on 29 February through 14 March.

The Moscow session resolved a variety of problems on which the two sides had failed to reach an accord at the Tokyo meeting. One of the difficult problems was to decide the fishing quota for salmon that have spawned in Soviet rivers to be caught by Japanese fishing boats in the open sea outside the Soviet 200-mile zone.

As is known to everyone, the basic position of the USSR has for many long years been that salmon fishing in the open sea is harmful because of irreversible damage it inflicts on salmon resources. Based on it, the USSR has successively reduced the quota for Japan. During the March negotiations in Tokyo, the Soviet Union proposed a total ban by 1992 on Japanese fishing in the open sea outside the Soviet 200-mile zone. The Soviet stance is consistent not only with its interests as a mother-river country for such precious fish as salmons but also with the 1982 UN Law of the Sea treaty providing for obligations concerning the general conditions of migratory fish and preservation of resources.

The settlement reached in the Moscow session set the Japanese quota at 20,800 tons, approximately 4,000 tons less than last year. However, the fisheries cooperation money, paid by Japan to cooperate with Soviet organizations in salmon spawning programs, remains the same as last year—3.7 billion yen.

In Moscow, it was also agreed to create joint ventures in the USSR, including those to increase salmon production, conduct oceanic fish resource surveys jointly, and to develop cooperation in new areas.

The two sides also stated their views that they should make detailed study of future fishing of fish other than salmon in the high seas of Bering and Okhotsk, fully comply with the principles and norms of international laws, and consider ways and means to ensure preservation and reasonable utilization of resources in their fishing operations.

The protocol of the fourth joint meeting of USSR-Japan and Japan-USSR fisheries committees was signed by Zilanov, deputy minister of the Soviet Fish Industry Ministry, and Unno, director of the Oceanic Fisheries Bureau of the Japanese Fisheries Agency.

Folowing the signing, Deputy Minister Zilanov said: The Soviet Union is satisfied with the series of interesting settlements reached at the Moscow meeting. For example, it is content with the possibility of setting up joint ventures and solving various issues such as developing joint operations in fishing and production of marine products and joint academic researches. A difficult issue in the negotiations was that of maintaining resources of salmons spawned in the rivers of the Soviet Far East.

Deputy Minister Zilanov continued: However, the two sides found a solution to this issue as well. The solution may not be completely satisfying to both sides. However, it gives the Japanese side the possibility of continued fishing. The principled position of the Soviet side on the use of salmon resources is well known. It still remains the same. However, we believe that salmon fishing can be continued in the Soviet 200-mile sea zone if the two sides keep up their efforts to preserve resources and catch reasonable quantities of fish.

Mr Unno, chief of the Japanese delegation, also expressed his satisfaction with the results of the salmon negotiations.

Briefs

Ship-Repairing Enterprise

Nakhodka April 28 TASS—Representatives of the Maritime Fishing Vessels Repairing Association and the Japanese firm Tokyo Maruichi Seiji have signed in this

Soviet-Japanese ship-repairing enterprise. Vitaily Nebello, general director of the Soviet association, told TASS that the two countries' specialists draw up documents now under which the joint venture will operate. [Text] [*LD300350 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 28 Apr 88*]

Soviet-Japanese Resort Complex

A new Soviet-Japanese joint enterprise will be set up to build a sports and resort complex on the Angara River, near Lake Baykal, for Soviet and foreign guests who wish to spend their holidays in that very picturesque place, often called the Gem of Siberia. The complex will include a medical center, using local medicinal muds and mineral water. [Text] [*LD030003 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 2 May 88*]

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese Envoy Expounds Position on Islands

PM021821 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Meeting in the SRV Embassy"]

[Text] A meeting with journalists was held on 29 April at the SRV Embassy in the Soviet Union, during which SRV Foreign Ministry materials were presented with regard to the problem of the island territories in the South China Sea. Nguyen Manh Cam, SRV ambassador to the USSR, who spoke to the gathering, expounded his country's position on these questions and stressed Vietnam's readiness to discuss all contentious elements at the negotiating table and its desire not to permit any steps capable of exacerbating the situation. Vietnam, the ambassador pointed out, is sincerely endeavoring to create a situation promoting detente and dialogue.

Journalists' questions were answered.

SRV Wants Hun Sen-Sihanouk Meetings To Resume

BK0105091788 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Station observer's commentary]

[Text] In the course of his visit to Manila, Vietnamese Deputy Foreign Minister Tran Quang Co told the press that Vietnam was prepared to withdraw troops from Cambodia on condition that the Cambodian problem is settled through negotiations and that the Pol Pot gang does not return to power. Comrade Tran Quang Co voiced support for the resumption of talks between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk.

Our observer writes that this statement showed Vietnam's constructive attitude regarding a political solution to the Cambodian problem.

We would like to recall that Vietnamese diplomats have made many trips to help promote talks between Phnom Penh and the opposition Khmer groups in line with the Ho Chi Minh City accord with Indonesia.

The meetings between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk took place in France within the framework of the national reconciliation policy proclaimed by the Cambodian leadership. The initial results were very salutary to the Cambodian solution. They highly valued the summit of the ASEAN countries in Manila. The encounter between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, however, failed to recommence because of statements by those opponents who have refused to give up their plans. According to most observers, the discontinuance of this meeting was caused by external obstacles, such as the growing activities of the Pol Pot rebels.

These rebels have built up a considerable amount of arms and ammunition along the Cambodian border. Pol Pot has personally supervised the transportation operations. Recently, Prince Ranariddh, who is a son of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, revealed a secret document to an AFP correspondent. The prince said that the Pol Pot group wanted to sever relations with its partners in the coalition government after the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia and then to advance toward grabbing power in Phnom Penh. It is most obvious that the question of total withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops is related to the political settlement of the Cambodian problem.

In his Manila interview, Comrade Tran Quang Co noted that the risk of seeing the Pol Pot gang return to power is an obstacle to the solution. The Cambodian people must be guaranteed freedom from tragedies like those they suffered under the Pol Pot regime.

The withdrawal of Vietnamese troops has been undertaken according to a program prepared in 1982. Following the sixth partial troop withdrawal which took place at the end of last year, the presence of the Vietnamese Army has been reduced by one-third. The ongoing events show that there are plenty of difficulties facing a Cambodian solution. But it is hoped that they can be overcome. As proof of this, we have the initial successes of the national reconciliation policy in Cambodia and external support, as well as Indonesia's constructive attitude in creating an atmosphere of good-neighborliness in Southeast Asia. And when he was in Manila, Comrade Tran Quang Co indicated Vietnam's desire to sign a nonaggression accord with all ASEAN countries.

Gilashvili Delegation Discusses Indonesian Ties

LD022003 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] A group of Soviet parliamentarians, headed by Comrade Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet, is continuing its visit to Indonesia. Our correspondent in Jakarta, Vladimir Beloshapko, reports:

[Beloshapko] We in Indonesia pursue with great interest the policies of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the policies of restructuring and glasnost. We also hope that Soviet-Indonesian relations will reach a higher level, particularly in the area of trade and economic cooperation. This was stated during a meeting with Soviet parliamentarians by Suhud, speaker of the Chamber of People's Representatives, the republic's parliament.

In a friendly atmosphere, the participants in the meeting exchanged views on the questions of bilateral relations and international problems. Suhud termed the normalization of relations between the USSR and the United States a happy event. If trust between your two states is strengthened, he said, the whole world will sleep more soundly. Indonesia considers it a duty, continued the Indonesian parliament speaker, to take part actively in efforts to strengthen universal peace.

We want security to become established on earth, and we want space to remain peaceful.

Comrade Gilashvili, the head of the Soviet delegation, again confirmed the USSR's desire to expand all-around relations with Indonesia. He noted the important contribution that parliamentarians of both countries can make to this cause.

The Soviet legislators also had a thorough conversation today with their Indonesian colleagues, members of the parliamentary commissions on foreign affairs and interparliamentary ties.

Near East & South Asia

'Conditions Exist' for Good Pakistan Relations

PM0305100288 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Yu. Shtykanov "International Commentary": "For Good-Neighborly Dialogue"]

[Text] The date 1 May 1948 was a noteworthy milestone in the history of relations between the USSR and Pakistan. On that day our countries established diplomatic relations.

In the last 40 years the development of Soviet-Pakistani relations has not been simple, although the Soviet Union's policy with regard to Pakistan has always been based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, equality, noninterference in internal affairs, and respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Soviet Union has invariably expressed the desire to develop and extend cooperation with Pakistan.

But this good-neighborly policy has not always met with the understanding of the Pakistani side, on which external forces which have no interest in improving Soviet-Pakistani relations have exerted pressure. On the basis of Pakistan's "great strategic significance," the United States strove to include it in an "anticommunist barrier" in Asia. This was the reason for Pakistan's participation in the aggressive military blocs CENTO and SEATO. Pressure from outside also played a part in Pakistan's making its territory available for the waging of undeclared war against the Afghan people.

Now that the Geneva agreements on a political settlement of the Afghanistan situation are coming into force, a real path is opened up toward unblocking one of the most complex present-day regional conflicts and normalizing the situation in Southwest Asia and the Middle East. An end to the bloodshed in Afghanistan meets the interests of both Afghans and Pakistanis.

In this context, it should be recalled that Pakistan's representatives, by signing the Geneva documents, took on a commitment not to permit on Pakistan territory the presence or concealment in camps and bases, or by any other means, the organization, training, financing, equipping, and arming of political and other groups with the aim of conducting subversive activity against the government of Afghanistan.

In the light of the Geneva accords, certain statements by Pakistani officials cannot fail to cause concern. For instance, Pakistani Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Zain Noorani stated: "After the signing of the Geneva agreements, Pakistan does not intend to throw the mujahidin out of the country."

It is quite clear that the sides that signed the Geneva agreements should not hamper, but promote the establishment of mutual understanding among Afghans, and should not undertake any actions that could lead to the exacerbation of the situation.

Many people in Pakistan adhere to this opinion. Thus, for instance, Malik Meradzh Khalik [as published], general secretary of the Pakistani Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization, assessing highly the agreements signed in Geneva, demanded that Islamabad take measures to prevent the Afghan opposition's use of the country's territory against Afghanistan's interests.

The establishment of regional cooperation also depends on the fulfillment of the Geneva agreements. Confrontation and distrust must give way to mutual understanding and the development of trade, economic, and cultural ties. The ending of the conflict in Afghanistan would, in particular, give a powerful boost to Soviet-Pakistani economic cooperation. Especially since our countries already have rich experience in this sphere of relations. The first agreement on technical and economic cooperation between our states, in the sphere of oil and gas prospecting, was signed as long ago as 1961.

The Soviet Union and Pakistan are states with different socioeconomic systems. But all the conditions exist for relations between them to develop smoothly. This would only promote the establishment of peace in the region and further Pakistan's economic progress.

Afghan Committee Prepares To Receive Refugees

Camps Established

LD012114 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 1 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 1 TASS—Another 68 refugees returned in Laghman and Nangarhar Provinces from Pakistan in the past 24 hours. The local government bodies assisted them in settling on the native land, BAKHTAR news agency reported. The State Committee for the Affairs of the Repatriates reported that 300 camps and centers where refugees can spend several days before being sent to native villages were set up in the border provinces. The committee set aside 87 million afghanis for assistance to returning fellow citizens.

Over a thousand families of the poor in Parwan Province received prime necessaries which were sent from the Soviet Union under the fraternal aid programme.

'Assistance Fund' Cited

LD021319 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] [Announcer] The Geneva agreements on a political settlement surrounding Afghanistan come into force in less than 2 weeks' time. One of the most important documents is the bilateral agreement between the Republic of Afghanistan and Pakistan on the voluntary return home of Afghan refugees. Aleksandr Shkirando, our Kabul correspondent, describes how preparations to receive the refugees are going in Afghanistan:

[Shkirando] In fact, these preparations began not today, but several years ago. The first step was the setting up of a State Committee for Refugees' Affairs under the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Afghanistan. Today, more than 300 centers for receiving refugees have already been established in border regions. Every day, about 10,000 people are received in these centers and the so-called Peace Hotels which exist in nearly all of Afghanistan's provinces. I was told recently by Hasan Sharq, chairman of the State Committee for Refugees' Affairs, that what is understood by the words receiving refugees in these centers is primarily the provision of medical assistance and the supply of food and everything necessary for normal life. The Soviet Union is giving us active assistance in this, Hasan Sharq noted. Thus, in the most recent period alone, the Committee for Refugees' Affairs has been given aid to a value of 1.23 million afghanis [amount as heard].

The problem of the refugees is a national tragedy for Afghanistan. It is known that families in Afghanistan are, as a rule, very large. But many of them have been split by the prolonged war. Some relatives, for example, find themselves in Iran, while others are in Pakistan. Now the members of the families who have remained in Afghanistan, and, indeed, all Afghans as a whole, are making every effort to ensure that their compatriots return home as soon as possible. The Geneva agreements have inspired the Afghan people to solve this problem without delay. Recently 9 million afghanis have been allocated for the refugees' assistance fund by state enterprises and public organizations, and 800,000 afghanis has been received from private enterepreneurs.

[Announcer] Let me add that the Afghan Government has confirmed its resolve to rigorously observe the provisions of the Geneva agreements on a settlement surrounding Afghanistan. This was stated by 'Abdul Wakil, minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan, at a meeting in Kabul with a group of UN observers of the fulfillment of the Geneva agreements. The minister also expressed hope that the other sides, too, will strictly observe the obligations they have taken upon themselves.

'Massive' Mudslide Kills 35 in Afghanistan

LD0305113288 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 3 TASS—A massive mudslide has crashed down on the village of Rabotak in the Afghan province of Samangan, killing 35 people and devastating hundreds of homes, BAKHTAR news agency reported.

The Afghan Government formed a special commission to size up the damage and provide relief aid. Practical work was started to deal with the consequences of the natural calamity.

Najibullah Greets Afghan Officers From USSR

LD022112 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 2 TASS—President of the Republic of Afghanistan Najibullah today received here Afghan officers, graduates of the higher military schools of the USSR, the BAKHTAR News Agency reported.

"You have returned home at a time when our entire people and its armed forces witnessed great achievements of the policy of national reconciliation: The conclusion of the elections to the National Council, the signing of the Geneva accords", the president said. "Your main task is to strengthen to the utmost, drawing on your knowledge, the country's defences, its independence and territorial integrity in conditions when a Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops starts returning home", Najibullah said.

Defense Minister of the Republic of Afghanistan Colonel-General Muhammad Rafi' was present at the meeting.

Weekly Praises Kuwaiti Handling of Hijack

LD302005 Kuwait KUNA in English 1910 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, April 30 (KUNA)—A Soviet weekly magazine Saturday hailed the Kuwaiti way of dealing with the hijacking of "Al-Jaberiya" airliner and its rejection to blackmail and terrorism.

"NOVOYE VREMYA" magazine, in a comment on the hijacking operation which lasted for 16 days, called on all countries of the world to benefit from the Kuwaiti political wisdom in dealing with the issue which resulted in the release of all passengers.

The magazine described Kuwait's style in dealing with the crisis as "unusual and creative" and lauded the Algerian role in the negotiations with the hijackers.

The magazine emphasized that had Kuwait bowed to blackmail and terrorism, a new wave of terror and hijacking would have been unleashed.

Syrian Official Thanks Ryzhkov for Greetings

PM011311 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Syrian Prime Minister M. al-Zu'bi message of thanks to USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N. Ryzhkov for "Evacuation Day" congratulations]

[Text] To Comrade Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

It was with a sense of deep gratitude and appreciation that I received the USSR Council of Ministers' congratulations on the 42d anniversary of "Evacuation Day."

We highly value the honest and just stance of the friendly Soviet Union, which is supporting our country and the Arab peoples in their just struggle against imperialist and Zionist aggression.

We share your assessment of the high level of multifaceted relations existing between our friendly countries, which are based on the strong, unshakable foundation of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. We are convinced that these relations will be further developed in various spheres for the good of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Syrian Arab Republic and for the sake of achieving victory and a just, all-embracing, and lasting peace in our region and in the world as a whole.

Please accept my gratitude and best wishes, comrade chairman of the Council of Ministers. I wish your government happiness and success, and I wish the Soviet people prosperity and future success on the path of progress.

Mahmud al-Zu'bi, prime minister of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopian Leader Refutes Charges on Famine Aid

LD020915 Moscow TASS in English 0807 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] Addis Ababa May 2 TASS—[Mengistu] Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia, president of the country, addressed a May-Day rally in Addis Ababa's Revolution Square yesterday. He pointed out that with the aid of the friendly states, Ethiopia had made sizable economic successes. Deposits of gold, uranium, natural gas and other minerals have been tapped. Industrial plants are under construction. Despite the fact that drought has permanently hit the country's northern areas, agriculture is developing. After the launching of the Melka Wakane Hydropower Plant, which was built with the Soviet Union's and Czechoslovakia's assistance, electricity output in the country has grown almost by fifty per cent.

At the same time Eritrean separatists acting together with splitters in Tigre province are launching fresh anti-Ethiopian sorties. The enemies of our people are trying to cause chaos in the cities wishing to precipitate an economic crisis in the country. They are stepping up a propaganda campaign with the aim of undermining our stable international ties.

Anti-Ethiopian forces claim that the government's decision to recall from the drought-striken areas the personnel of international organisations for "security reasons" will lead to the death of two million people. These fabrications are unfounded since 80 per cent of operations for aid to the famishing people are carried out by Ethiopian organisations and 99 per cent of the personnel of all such organisations operating in Ethiopia are the country's citizens.

None of the organisations for relief aid to the drought victims has been sent to Ethiopia on the instructions or initiative of the U.S. President, Mengistu Haile Mariam noted.

The more deplorable then are anti-Ethiopian statements by representatives of the U.S. Administration, including the President, that the operations for aid to the drought victims have ended. The aim of such pronouncements is to mislead world public.

Envoy Discusses South African Policy, Reforms

MB291146 Johannesburg THE STAR in English 29 Apr 88 p 7

[By Gerald L'Ange]

[Text] Maseru—In promoting "perestroyka" the Soviet Union will not compromise on matters of principle such as support for the "liberation movements" or the MPLA government in Angola, says the acting Soviet ambassador to Lesotho, Dr Boris Asoyan. He made it clear in an address to students at the University of Lesotho yesterday that the Soviet Union still supports the African National Congress and its use of violence insofar as this might be considered necessary.

And it will continue to support sanctions against South Africa to help bring about the abolition of apartheid.

Answering questions at the end of his address, Dr Asoyan said one of the goals of perestroyka (restructuring) was to create an atmosphere of trust and confidence among nations which would be the basis for a safer world.

He said there was "no question of our compromising on Angola or any of the liberation movements".

While the Soviet Union was not taking part in negotiations between the Angolan Government and the United States it respected Angola's right to conduct such negotiations, Dr Asoyan said.

On the question of whether there was a parallel between the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and its stance in Angola, Dr Asoyan repeated Soviet Foreign Minister Mr Eduard Shevardnadze's recent response to the same question—that the only similarity was that the name of both countries began with the letter "A". Dr Asoyan said in response to another question that there was no connection between Mozambican President Joaquim Chissano's visit to Moscow and his representative's meeting in Cape Town this week with the State President Mr P.W. Botha.

In his address to the University students, Dr Asoyan said the reforms instituted by the Botha government in South Africa "penetrated only the upper and very thin layer of apartheid, which had already by itself become rotten".

Confrontation in South Africa had reached such a stage, he said, that nothing but a fundamental reform of government and social structure would stop an accelerated movement to "more horrible violence".

Dr Asoyan asked how long the Afrikaner, whose sufferings at the beginning of this century had drawn the sympathy of many countries, would continue to turn a blind eye to the crimes of apartheid.

He said that from the speeches of white leaders in South Africa "one can judge there is very little trust from their side". On the contrary, there is more hostility and unwillingness to know and to understand.

"They had only one idea—to suppress and to impose their will, their decisions, on the majority.

"They talk of the necessity of changes but think how to evade changes."

A clear lack of confidence ran through all the arguments about the necessity of change.

Dr Asoyan said the Soviet Union did not want to see chaos in South Africa.

"We are for constructive decisions. We want to see the end of confrontation in the southern African region and the only way to achieve this is to stop South African aggression against the Frontline states." South Africa, he said, was still growing—"sometimes violently and wildly"—at a time when some other states were declining.

East Europe

Jaruzelski: Strike Control Will Prevent Anarchy

LD0305130088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0230 GMT 3 May 88

[From the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] Wojciech Jaruzelski has stated that the Polish Government will not allow adventurers and destructive forces once again to cause the country to fall into a state of anarchy and unrest. This statement was made because of a strike by 16,000 steel workers in Krakow, which the secret leaders of Solidarity have tried to use for their purposes. It is not without their help that a strike has broken out in Gdansk now also. This is already the fifth strike in Poland during the last week.

May Day Demonstrations Not Disrupted

LD021214 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] The number of participants in the May Day demonstrations in Poland was on a par with last year and this is regarded as indicating a high level of activity by the country's population, stated Jerzy Urban, the Polish Government's press spokesman at a news conference in Warsaw. The demonstrations, he noted, took place in a good atmosphere and there was high level participation by young people. Calls to boycott the demonstrations issued by opposition forces failed and the provocative calls for the demonstrations to be disrupted and for various obstacles to be set up were ineffective.

Urban reported that there were also attempts to organize counter-demonstrations. All of them began at churches as services ended, despite the sensible position of the church which called for calm. The counter-demonstrations in Gdansk and Warsaw at the church of St Stanislawa Kostki were particularly aggressive. In all around 12,000 people took part in these demonstrations around the country. That shows that the intense political agitation, pamphlets, and appeals had virtually no major effect.

PPR Government Hopes To Counteract Inflation

PM021321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Draft Law Remitted"]

[Text] Warsaw, 1 May—According to PAP reports, yesterday's session of the Polish Council of Ministers reemphasized the determination to consistently implement the provisions of the economic reform's second stage, this being a condition for the steady improvement of the population's material living standards.

In conformity with the declaration by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of Poland's Council of State, at the 10th United Peasant Party Congress in March this year, and also in line with the PZPR Central Committee Politburo resolution addressed to the PZPR Deputies' Club in the Polish Sejm, the government examined and adopted a draft law on granting emergency powers to the Polish Council of Ministers. The aim of the proposed decisions is to counteract excessive price and wage increases and other inflationary phenomena and to accelerate the achievement of equilibrium in the economy and the creation of opportunities to fully implement the economic reform's second stage.

The draft law was remitted to the Polish Sejm.

Gosplan Chief Maslyukov Receives Polish Minister

PM291255 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Yu.D. Maslyukov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, on 27 April received B. Ferensztajn, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and Polish minister of town and country planning and construction, who is in Moscow.

W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR, participated in the conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Further Reportage on Vorotnikov SFRY Visit

Talks With Gracanin

LD271434 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 27 Apr 88

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Apr (TASS)—Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, who is on an official visit here, today had a meeting with Petar Gracanin, president of the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Serbia.

The sides noted that the official visit of friendship paid to the SFRY by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has become one of the most important political events in the Soviet-Yugoslav relations, has strengthened the atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding between both countries, and has revealed a similarity [skhodstvo] of approaches toward a number of major problems of socialist development and international relations.

The general expansion, in recent years, of the friendly ties and cooperation between the RSFSR and Serbia was noted with satisfaction. It was emphasized that the interaction between the two republics is acquiring an evermore multifaceted nature, currently representing a whole range of various measures being implemented on the basis of the accords that have been reached.

Today Vitaliy Vorotnikov visited the "Beko" Textile Industry Production Association in Belgrade. It maintains close business ties with its Soviet partners.

Final talks today took place between Vitaliy Vorotnikov and Desimir Jevtic, chairman of the Executive Council of Serbia. A focal point of attention were questions regarding the state of and further prospects for the development of friendly ties between the two republics. It was noted that considerable results have been attained over the past period in the interaction between the Russian Federation and Serbia. These have facilitated a broadening and enrichment of bilateral Soviet-Yugoslav relations as a whole. Contacts and cooperation have developed successfully on a governmental level, between ministries, departments, and organizations in the two republics.

The sides stressed the need for mutual efforts aimed at improving the development of balanced economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation between the RSFSR and Serbia, making use of modern forms of cooperation. They stated their willingness to broaden direct friendly ties between the krays, towns, and cities, and working collectives.

An exchange of information took place on topical questions regarding life at home in both republics, on plans for their further socioeconomic development aimed at implementation of the policy of restructuring in the RSFSR and economic stabilization in Serbia.

At the conclusion of the talks Vitaliy Vorotnikov and Desimir Jevtic signed a program of the basic trends in cooperation between the RSFSR and Serbia for 1988-1990. It envisages the broadening and deepening of relations in a series of different spheres, lays the foundations so that friendly ties and cooperation between the two republics are raised to a qualitatively new stage.

Desimir Jevtic gave a dinner in honor of Vitaliy Vorotnikov. Viktor Maltsev, USSR ambassador to the SFRY, was present at the talks and meeting.

Signs Cooperation Program

LD271616 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 27 Apr 88

[Text] Belgrade April 27 TASS—Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, held the final talks today with President of the Executive Council of the Assembly of Serbia, Desimir Jevtic. Questions related to the state of and prospects for the further development of friendly ties between the two republics, were in the focus of attention. It was noted that significant results have been achieved in the interaction between the Russian Federation and Serbia over the past period. They promoted the widening of bilateral Soviet-Yugoslav relations as a whole and their enrichment. Contacts and cooperation at the governmental level, between ministries, directorates and organisations of the two republics, developed successfully. The sides emphasized the expediency of mutual effort toward upgrading the development of balanced economic, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation between the Russian Federation and Serbia with the use of its up-to-date forms. They proclaimed the readiness to expand direct friendly ties between the territories, cities and work collectives.

An exchange of information was held on topical matters of the internal life of the two republics, on the plans of their further social and economic development aimed at the implementation of perestroyka in the Russian Federation and economic stabilization in Serbia.

Upon the conclusion of the talks Vitaliy Vorotnikov and Desimir Jevtic signed the programme of the fundamental directions of cooperation between the Russian Federation and Serbia for 1988-1990. It envisages the widening and deepening of relations in a number of areas, lays the foundation for the friendly ties and cooperation between the two republics reaching a qualitatively new stage.

Desimir Jevtic gave a dinner in honour of Vitaliy Vorotnikov.

USSR Ambassador to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Victor Maltsev was present at the meetings and talks.

Visits Aluminium Combine

LD281237 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 28 Apr 88

[Text] Titograd, 28 Apr (TASS)—Vitaliy Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and RSFSR Council of Ministers chairman, is continuing his official friendly visit to Yugoslavia. Today he visited the Titograd Aluminium Combine. This enterprise, built with the economic and technical assistance of the Soviet Union, is an example of the fruitfully developing cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY. The capacity of the combine is 100,000 tonnes of aluminium and semifinished goods per year. In 1987, 101,000 tonnes of aluminium were produced. About 50 percent of the output goes for export.

The guest from the USSR was briefed on the organization of the works, and met representatives of the labor collective.

Viktor Maltsev, USSR ambassador to the SFRY, attended the meetings.

Montenegro Meeting

PM011259 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 88 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Meetings on Montenegrin Soil"]

[Excerpts] Titograd, 28 Apr—V.I. Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and RSFSR Council of Ministers chairman, is continuing his official friendly visit to Yugoslavia. Today he met with R. Brajovic, president of the Presidency of the Socialist Republic of Montenegro.

The sides emphasized that the visit of M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to the SFRY was an important juncture in the successful development of ties between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. The documents adopted during that visit open up new opportunities for the further expansion of friendly ties and cooperation between the RSFSR and Montenegro within the framework of Soviet-Yugoslav relations. The practical realization of the accords at the highest level, it was pointed out in the talks, is the chief common task.

During the talks the sides briefed each other on their republics' internal development and exchanged opinions on some urgent international problems.

V.I. Vorotnikov held final talks with V. Vukadinovic, president of the Executive Council of the Montenegrin Assembly. Great attention was devoted to specific questions of economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation between the RSFSR and Montenegro. Under the conditions of restructuring in the USSR and the improvement of the economic and political system in Yugoslavia, it was pointed out in the talks, a resolute switch must be made to the practical introduction of higher forms of cooperation. The policy of developing ties between the two republics is defined in the program of the main areas of cooperation between the RSFSR and Montenegro for 1988-1990.

The sides emphasized that the talks held were a dialogue between colleagues in a common cause with a sincere interest in each other's successes and in the fuller revelation of socialism's material and spiritual potential. [passage omitted]

V.I. Vorotnikov pointed out in a television interview that meetings and talks were held with the leaders of Yugoslavia, Serbia, and Montenegro and with representatives of labor collectives. We sensed the great beneficial impact which the recent visit of M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to the SFRY had on our countries' relations, he said. We have great opportunities—and we are fully determined to use them—for further developing cooperation in the political, economic, and cultural spheres. There are also good preconditions for strengthening Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation in the sphere of international relations.

Strong, multifaceted ties have been established between the RSFSR, Serbia, and Montenegro. It is particularly important, V.I. Vorotnikov pointed out, that direct business and production ties have begun to expand between enterprises and labor collectives. Such contacts are undoubtedly mutually advantageous.

Tours Budva, Kotor

LD291619 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] Titograd April 29 TASS—Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, on an official friendly visit in Yugoslavia, today visited the city of Budva, one of the country's tourist centres.

He attended a ceremony of unveiling the old town restored after the 1979 earthquake.

He next visited Kotor, one of the oldest towns in Montenegro, known for its revolutionary traditions. Its museum has documents describing Kotor's historical ties with Russia.

First captains of the Russian Navy set up by Peter the Great studied navigation there. Nowadays, Kotor is an industrial, cultural and tourist centre in Montenegro.

Vorotnikov toured the city, met its leaders. He familiarised himself with the life and prospects of its development.

Miljan Radovic, chairman of the presidium of the League of Communists of Montenegro Central Committee, held a dinner in honour of the visitor from the USSR.

Returns to Moscow

PM021505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Visit Ends"]

[Text] On 29 April V.I. Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and RSFSR Council of Ministers chairman, who had been visiting Yugoslavia at the invitation of the Executive Councils of the Assemblies of Serbia and Montenegro, left for home. He was seen off at the airport in Tivat by V. Vukadinovic, president of the Executive Council of the Montenegro Assembly, S. Sekaric, secretary of the League of Communists of Montenegro Central Committee Presidium, and other officials.

Among those seeing him off was also V.F. Maltsev, USSR ambassador to SFRY.

At the airport in Moscow V.I. Vorotnikov was met by M.S. Solomentsev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, deputy chairmen of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Among those welcoming him was also M. Veres, SFRY ambassador to the USSR.

Mojsov Expresses Interest in Gorbachev Proposals

LD021417 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] Belgrade May 2 TASS—Yugoslavia, as a European, Mediterranean and nonaligned country, along with the world public received with profound interest the proposals on Mediterranean made by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev. This was stated by President of the collective Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Lazar Mojsov in an interview to the Egyptian news agency MENA. The Mediterranean countries advocate development of all-round and equal cooperation, establishment through joint efforts and without foreign interference of the foundations for consolidation of security in the region, Lazar Mojsov said.

Gromyko Accepts Ceausescu Invitation To Visit
LD021318 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1255GMT 2 May 88

[Excerpt] Bucharest, 2 May (TANJUG)—It has been learned in the diplomatic circles in Bucharest that Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is to arrive soon for a 4-day official and friendly visit to Romania, at the invitation of Romanian head of state Nicolae Ceausescu. It is understood that Gromyko will arrive in Romania on 10 May. This will be his first visit to see the Romanian head of state. [passage omitted]

Bulgarians Have Model for Ministry Restructuring
PM281553 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Apr 88 p 1

[Reader's letter from Candidate of Economic Sciences O. Osipenko under the rubric "First Response" replying to the articles "Illusion of Rights," "Alternative Option," and "Leading Link" by G. Popov in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 2, 5, and 12 April: "Elective 'Headquarters'?"—Popov's "Leading Link" article is published in the 26 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 46]

[Text] Moscow—I do not think I will be the only person prompted to write in by Professor G. Popov's three articles. Of course, the writer is not irreproachably logical in all his arguments. For the sake of objectivity the debit side of residual economic accountability [khozraschet] should have been covered in greater detail. In particular, the patent injustice of paying collectives for disrupting the work of their associated plants, which is a norm of centrally allocated supply. Other drawbacks could also be cited.

However, in at least two respects G. Popov's model for restructuring the economic mechanism is beyond reproach. First, it is radical. Second, it is systematic. It is indisputable, for instance, that economic accountability will not work without changing enterprises' external "environment."

But I would like to draw attention to the following. In G. Popov's opinion, the functions of industrial ministries should be transferred to local and intersector management organs. That is, the sector principle of management would be consigned to the archives.

It seems to me that there is really no place in the new economic management system for ministries as presently constituted. But a categorical abandonment of this format in general would be premature. Why not use the option chosen by Bulgaria, for instance? That is, to resolutely reduce the number of ministries and—this is the main thing—to restructure them. The ministry collegium is a board of directors culled from leading enterprises. The minister is first among equals and elected by his colleague directors to coordinate enterprise activity. He can be removed from his position at any time by those who elected him, rather than by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The minister need not necessarily be a government member since the ministry in this form is an organ whose expenses are met out of voluntary contributions from enterprises.

It may be said that this is unrealistic under our conditions. The scales are different. Wouldn't it all lead to anarchy? I think these fears are unfounded. I recently spoke with former schoolfriends who are economists at enterprises whose ministries have been "consolidated" or scrapped. They said bluntly that the elimination of the "headquarters" had not produced any changes. Certain people claim that life has gotten easier.

So why, may I ask, have these ministries been kept?

Candidate of Economic Sciences O. Osipenko

Mueckenberger Ends Visit to Ukraine
AU281549 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 20 Apr 88 p 4

[RATAU report: "Visible Fruits of Friendship"

[Excerpts] Meetings with the working people are always memorable; they strengthen us, make us more confident, and teach us to be sharp-sighted. Here at the enormous international project one especially feels the breath of the times, one can see how far a united socialist industry can go, and how visible are the fruits produced by friendship among our fraternal peoples are very visible, said Erich Mueckenberger, SED Central Committee Politburo member, chairman of the SED Central Party Control Commission, and president of the German-Soviet Friendship Society. He spent 2 days familiarizing himself with the progress made in the construction of the Krivoy Rog oxidized ore mining and enriching combine, an important international CEMA project. [passage omitted]

While at "Mayak" residential settlement, E. Mueckenberger delivered a lengthy speech at a conference of the local basic organization of the German-Soviet Friendship Society. He gave an account of the path covered by the GDR which soon will commemorate its 40th anniversary of the struggle waged by German Communists for the working people's happiness, and of the progress made in implementing the decisions of the 11th Congress. The speaker dedicated a significant part of his speech to the fraternal f[illegible]ndship between the peoples of the GDR and the USSR, to the combat alliance between the SED and the CPSU, and touched upon prospects for external economic relations between the two countries.

To stormy applause from the audience, E. Mueckenberger presented representatives of the project with a replica of the banner which in the twenties was conveyed by Krivoy Rog miners to their Mannsfeld colleagues as a sign of friendship and solidarity. This banner was saved by German anti-fascists, and is at present in the Berlin Museum of German History.

In discharging my very honorable duty on the heroic Ukrainian soil, the visitor said, I hand over the legendary Krivoy Rog banner to the project. It will be presented to collective winners in socialist competitions to implement the 11th SED Congress decisions to enhance and deepen the traditions of German-Soviet friendship. We old communists are confident that the invincible Krivoy Rog banner will also repeatedly and brilliantly attest to your labor accomplishments, as during the dark night of fascism it inspired, like a leading light, German patriots in the struggle against the reaction. The visitor toured Krivoy Rog, familiarized himself with transportation work, in particular on the fast streetcar route, and visited the Palace of Culture belonging to the M.S. Kirov ore mining administration, and the "Kaskad" dispensary of the "Krivbasshakhtoprokhodka" combine.

During the trips to Krivoy Rog and to the international project in Dolinakaya the visitor was accompanied by V.A. Ivashko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Dnepropetrovsk Obkom first secretary; N.I. Samilyk, Kirovograd Obkom first secretary; V.P. Osnach, Presidium chairman of the Ukrainian Friendship Society; and S. Heldtke, GDR consul general in Kiev.

On 17 April E. Mueckenberger, SED Central Committee Politburo member and party Control Commission chairman, left for home. During a stopover at Borispol airport, he was met and seen off by Yu.N. Yelchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and secretary; M.D. Polyanichko, Foreign Relations Department deputy chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; and other officials.

Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society Meets

LD291447 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2200 GMT 28 Apr 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] An expanded session of the central board of the Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society, devoted to the 30th anniversary of its founding, has been held in Moscow. It was stressed in reports that the society saw its main task as increasing the sentiments of friendship and comradely solidarity of Soviet people with the working people of Albania, who are building socialism. Measures were outlined to give the public a wider acquaintance with the revolutionary-democratic traditions of the Albanian people, their life and work. A photographic exhibition and an exhibition of books about Albania published in the USSR have been organized to mark the anniversary.

West Europe

Adamishin Holds News Conference in London

LD300110 Moscow TASS in English 2257 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] London April 30 TASS—The signing of the Geneva agreements on the settlement relating to Afghanistan is a breakthrough in resolving regional conflicts. This breakthrough is comparable only to the signing of the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty, the USSR Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Anatoliy Adamishin has told a press conference at the Soviet Embassy here.

As a special representative of the Soviet leadership, Adamishin had talks in London with Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Geoffrey Howe and Assistant Secretary of State of the United States Chester Crocker.

The Soviet representative emphasized that Pakistan and Afghanistan had reached agreement on strict non-interference in each other's affairs and had taken rather strict commitments.

The contracting parties agreed to prevent within their territory the training, equipping, financing, and recruitment of mercenaries from whatever origin, to prevent the harbouring of individuals and groups for the purpose of creating subversion in the territory of the other party.

The documents have been so formed that by the time the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is planned to begin on May 15, conditions must be created to discontinue foreign interference in that country's affairs, Adamishin noted.

Dismissing NATO Nuclear Planning Group's charges at a recent session in Brussels that the USSR was retargeting its ICBM's on Europe to compensate for nuclear forces lost in a Soviet-U.S. cut, Adamishin said: "Our position is clear, we stand not for a compensation, but for cutting surpluses in all spheres and types of armaments. This is our offer to the West: Let us exchange data on how much weapons—nuclear, chemical and conventional...each of us has. Let us compare them and eliminate the advantage one side may have to an equal minimum level".

Voss Interviewed on Parliamentary Visit to UK

LD022138 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 2 May 88

[Excerpts] A three-man delegation of the Supreme Soviet has returned from Britain after attending the World Conference of Parliamentary and Religious Leaders on the Survival of Humanity. The delegates were: Avgust

Voss, chairman of the House of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet; Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences; and Valentina Tereshkova, the first woman astronaut and now head of the Soviet Society for Friendship With Foreign Countries.

When the conference in Oxford ended, the Soviet group stayed on for a short while as guests of the speaker of the House, Bernard Weatherill. The leader of the group, Avgust Voss, has granted an interview to our correspondent, Nikolay Gorshkov. [passage omitted]

In London, the Soviet delegation was received by the prime minister, Mrs Thatcher, and by Sir Geoffrey Howe. It also had many meetings in parliamentary commissions, at the Royal Institute of International Relations, and at the British-USSR Association. Our correspondent asked Avgust Voss whether he felt the outcome of these discussions would promote the Soviet-British dialogue.

[Begin Voss recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] We believe our visit was fruitful and very useful for parliamentary contacts between the two countries. One of the important aspects was the frank and business-like discussion of the most urgent international problems. We focused on ways to slow down the arms race and promote disarmament, and stressed the significant roles that members of parliament and the public can play in this work. This is especially important today because the first agreement abolishing two classes of nuclear weapons has come up for ratification. [end recording]

Our correspondent suggested the turning point in Soviet-British parliamentary contacts came when a delegation of the Supreme Soviet led by Mikhail Gorbachev visited Britain in December 1984. Avgust Voss agreed.

[Begin Voss recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] Quite right, and we have agreed to give special attention to promoting the tradition established during that visit. [passage omitted] As we see it, Soviet-British relations are gaining momentum, and it is important that members of Parliament should not lag behind. [end recording]

What was Mrs Thatcher's opinion about this?

[Begin Voss recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] Mrs Thatcher noted the important role of her meetings in 1984 with the head of the Supreme Soviet delegation, Mikhail Gorbachev, in promoting contacts in all areas of bilateral relations. She said there should be more visits to build up trust, to promote a direct and frank political dialgoue, and to expand trade and mutually advantageous cooperation. She felt there had been good progress in this area in recent years. Mrs Thatcher described the visit of our group as another indication that contacts were growing to the benefit of both countries. She also expressed support for the agreements signed in Geneva adjusting the situation involving Afghanistan and said her government looked forward to the Soviet-United States summit in Moscow. On the whole, Mrs Thatcher felt there was more possibility today than ever before to establish mutual trust in disarmament problems. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Dobrynin Meets With FRG Opposition Leaders

PM021833 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 29 April A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and V.V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, received representatives of the Social Democratic Party [SPD] of Germany. The group is attending a USSR and FRG public meeting on the theme "Stability in Europe," organized by the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation and the West German F. Ebert Foundation. They include E. Bahr, member of the SPD Presidium, and Bundestag Deputies A. von Buelow, K. Voigt, K. Fuchs, E. Horn, G. Erler, and H. Jungmann.

During a lively, frank, and friendly conversation, an exchange of views on a wide range of questions was held. First of all, both sides touched on and discussed the question of ways to ensure European security following the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The West German participants in the talks displayed lively interest in the course and prospects of the Soviet-American talks on reducing strategic offensive arms, which is to be closely linked with the observance of the ABM Treaty. Various aspects of the impact of Soviet-American relations on the situation in Europe were touched on, as well as, in a broader context, the problem of European-U.S. ties in strengthening peace and developing East-West cooperation.

Naturally, the discussion also dwelt on questions of the military balance of forces in Europe, the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces, a transition to the concepts of sensible sufficiency, and "nonoffensive defense." In this context, the Soviet side clearly declared the USSR's readiness not only to implement a full exchange of the necessary information concerning the sides' armed forces, but also to embark in the very near future on practical talks on their substantial reduction with the simultaneous elimination of existing asymmetries. Under these conditions, the Soviet Union will be ready to comply with the broadest verification and inspection measures.

In view of the deepening process of integration under way in the West and East of the continent, an exchange of views was also held on this theme. Not only economic but also political and military aspects of this complex of

problems were touched on. Both sides expressed the view that the integration processes must be a means rather than an obstacle to ensuring mutually advantageous, truly peace-loving cooperation between the two parts of the continent.

Summing up the results of the meeting, its participants noted the fruitfulness of contacts of this kind and expressed the view that it is expedient to continue and deepen them.

Gorbachev Congratulates Luxembourg CP Chairman

PM021519 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 88 Second Edition p 1

[Gorbachev message to Urbany, chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg]

[Text] To Comrade Rene Urbany, chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg.

Dear Comrade Rene Urbany! I cordially congratulate you on your election as chairman of the Communist Party of Luxembourg.

I wish you and, through you, all Luxembourg Communists, success in implementing the tasks set by the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Luxembourg.

M. Gorbachev.

Latin America & Caribbean

Ortega Notes Conditions for Talks With Contras

LD030557 Moscow TASS in English 0552 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Managua May 3 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Kurguzov reports:

The Government of Nicaragua will discontinue talks with the contras in the event of a continuation of the obstructionist policy by the so-called "resistance" which hinders the taking of any specific steps to end the war in the country. This was pointed out here on Monday in an interview with journalists by the Republic's President Daniel Ortega.

He pointed out that, despite the demands of the contras, the talks should be held on the territory of Nicaragua, and said that the government would take a decision on this issue in the coming days.

The contras should discontinue the armed actions and reach such a decision before May 30 when the temporary truce under the Sapoa agreements expires. Otherwise, we shall launch the largest-scale offensive to do away with the contras forever. The contras have no other way out but to disarm and to start a peaceful life, Daniel Ortega emphasized.

The Nicaraguan president pointed out that the U.S. Administration had recently extended the economic and trade embargo against the Republic for a year, the embargo which undermines the national economy.

Under these conditions Nicaragua relies on the unselfish assistance of socialist countries which extended a fraternal helping hand to the young Republic and render all-round scientific technical and economic assistance.

The Nicaraguan leader highly appreciated the solidarity shown by socialist countries which had come to the aid of the Nicaraguan people in the difficult conditions of the economic blockade.

Briefs

Cuban Pipeline Project

A contract has been signed in Havana for the construction of Cuba's first oil pipeline. The USSR will provide assistance to the project. According to correspondent Viktor Gorbachev, the pipeline is to be called "Friendship" [druzhba] and will be almost 200 km long. Its construction is to take 2 years. Soviet specialists will be responsible for the main part of the work, but they will train Cuban engineers who will subsequently be able to build new oil pipelines for Cuba. [Summary] [*LD022342 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 2 May 88*]

Political & Social

Reader Warns Against Gorbachev Removal

PM021345 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 30 Apr 88 p 5

[Readers' letters page under the rubric "Returning to Items Published Earlier" and the general heading "More Democracy—More Socialism"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] This page of the newspaper could easily have been called "Political Letters Hour." The problems of the further development of democracy and glasnost, the formation of the ideology of renewal, the development of criticism and self-criticism in the party—readers write about this with passion and commitment. A great influx of letters was prompted by the following articles: Gavriil Popov's "There Is No Way Back" (7 April) [published in the 8 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT p 52], Aleksandr Gelman's "Time for Mustering Forces" (9 April) [published in the 22 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT p 41], Leonid Goldin's "A Say for Everyone, Glasnost for All" (16 February) [published in the 25 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT p 48], Nikolay Popov's "Is Anyone Above the Law?" (26 April) [published in the 2 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT p 63], and Oleg Temushkin's "Untruth Alone Is to Our Loss" (19 March), as well as other newspaper items published on the threshold of the 19th all-union party conference. We do not want to comment on today's responses to these articles or impose our own viewpoint on anyone. We will only observe that under the rubric "We, the Undersigned..." we have printed letters with which the editorial board does not agree. But that does not mean that these opinions should be hushed up. After all, the feelings of a certain proportion of people in our society lie behind such statements. Let readers analyze for themselves and draw their own conclusions as to who is right in today's disputes about democracy, glasnost, and socialism. We thank everyone who has responded to these articles.

I Have No Party Card [subhead]

I would subscribe to every thesis put forward by A. Gelman, but the question is: Does anyone need help from me, a "nonparty pudding," in this matter?

Judge for yourselves: The speech was delivered at an open party meeting, but the text of the speech was taken as the mandate of the Communists of the party organization. But what about the nonparty people? Are they for, or against? I realize that at open party meetings nonparty people only take up space in the auditorium. Why they are invited is a mystery to me, to this day. For decades, "assurances" have been visible everywhere: "The people and the party are one!", but when it comes to the resolution of cardinal questions, the people are "left out of the equation." What should we do, we nonparty people, form "our own" party? Why not hold two "rounds" of voting at the same party meeting (an open meeting, I emphasize)—one for Communists, to comply with the requirements—obsolete, in my view—of the Statutes, and one for the nonparty people who are present. I am sure the authority of this common decision of the meeting would only be increased. If we are waging a struggle for democratization, it must begin in every party (and not only party) organization, and not wait for decisions from above. I believe the cause of restructuring affects every citizen personally, and I propose holding the widest possible party meetings involving all those who wish to attend from among the nonparty staffers of a given organization, enterprise, kolkhoz, and so forth. Let everyone who wants to, express his view about the tasks of restructuring, and then it will be clearly seen who is who.

G. Tkachenko, Orel.

What About the Deputies? [subhead]

On reading A. Gelman's speech, I imagined the following picture. A department in which there are a great many rooms. In one sits the chief office curators (that is the only name for them) of whole peoples (Tatars, Jews, Armenians...), who perhaps only became what they are after being granted Moscow residence permits. The resolution of those peoples' urgent problems depends on them. In a word, questions of relations between nations are resolved at departmental level, like questions of trade or light industry.

But why break down an open door? After all, we have the world's most authoritative organ, which is supposed to "study in detail all problems of relations between nations, to take preventive measures, and not to allow the resolution of such questions to degenerate into mass protest demonstrations" (I quote A. Gelman). I am talking about one of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet—the Soviet of Nationalities. We elect deputies to that organ and have a right to expect from them not only representation, but fruitful work to strengthen true friendship among peoples. It is not a question of creating new structures—these too could become ineffective—but of ensuring that the existing ones operate effectively. How to do this is another question.

T. Sultanov, Gorkiy.

Where Glasnost Has Limits [subhead]

I fully support those who believe that the length of continuous work in elected posts should be restricted to 8-10 years. It is a peculiarity of our political system that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary is also our country's leader. Therefore, his replacement or appointment is by no means an internal affair for the participants in Central Committee plenums. The final decision should be for the people, and should therefore be submitted to a nationwide referendum. The powers of the Central Committee plenum should be restricted

solely to raising the question of replacing the general secretary. This should be followed by polemics in the mass media between the supporters and opponents of that decision. Thus we will be safeguarded against the chance circumstance of our country's fate being decided by a small circle of voters. At present a plenum at which M.S. Gorbachev could be removed with the formula mentioned by Gelman, "for glasnost without limits," or any other formula is entirely realistic. The support of the party apparatus for our leader is by no means ubiquitous or unanimous or always sincere. If an attempt is made to block restructuring, this time the people will not remain silent. Nearly all the citizens of the Soviet Union are for Gorbachev, and a handful of people waiting behind the double doors of their offices are against him!

Ya. Borokhovich, Nizhnevartovsk.

Living Off Others [subhead]

Strange as it may seem, for many years we lived on demagoguery. It blocked all the pores of our life, restricted our breathing, destroyed our faith in just ideals. From platforms and newspaper columns the golden age of developed socialism was heralded, yet the country was sliding unchecked into the abyss of spiritual aridity, into the quagmire of industrial paralysis.

All this dragged on for years, and to expect it all to have disappeared overnight, to have become a thing of the past, to expect restructuring to have put everything to rights, is not only naive, but shows irresponsibility toward the future. To think in this way is tantamount to continuing to lie and dissemble, to engage in the same old demagoguery, whose expression, it seems, has not yet been wiped off our faces.

The only ones to have "departed" are those who simply had to depart, those who should have been in jail a long time ago. All the rest are still lording it in their official positions, profoundly lamenting the happy days of their carefree rule in the past.

The bureaucratic machine, whose essence comprises not only demagoguery and administration by red tape but also terrorist methods for suppression of personality, is unlikely to surrender its positions easily. It realizes that now there is nothing more dangerous for it than glasnost and the freedom of thinking. Is this not why there are increasingly frequent exclamations about the nihilism of critical articles, warnings about the "wild outbursts" of democracy, and even hints about the loss of allegedly socialist positions?

It is these depths of bureaucratism that have brought forth the simplistic social security philosophy which has now started to do the rounds of the cities and countryside alike: Yes, he is not quite coping with his work, but we cannot really leave him without pay.... But why can't we, as a matter of fact?

This philosophy has actually infiltrated the ranks of workers and peasants. Here also one can hear it said at times: "Ah, they are having a go at the labor collective!" But there is silence about the fact that the collective is not earning its keep and is, in fact, parasitizing.

It is naive to assume that the bureaucratic mass, held soundly together by means of corporate interests, will easily surrender its positions. Take the agro-industrial complex as example. No matter who you talk to at the local level, on the farms, they are all unanimous that rayon agro-industrial associations staffs are highly inflated, that the present numerical strength of agrarian officialdom at rayon level would be sufficient to set up a couple more administrative apparatuses and still leave a remainder, that the work style is not changing: The crop farmer is still working under the rayon boss's diktat. Kolkhozes can still uphold the authority of their general assembly to a certain extent. But sovkhozes are totally defenseless. They have administrations which are accountable to their superiors and, even when they are obstinate, they cannot stand up to pressure from the rayon. After all, rayon offices have at their disposal a whole arsenal of bureaucratic tricks, administrative catches, and instructions, and you have to be a superman to stand up to them.

Moreover, the bureaucracy in our country traditionally identifies itself with the state, having arrogated to itself the moral right to allegedly express the people's interests. Any talk about democratization and glasnost is like a stab in its heart. It likes words about measured criticism, about truth derived from practical work [otrabotannoy pravde]. Who else but the spokesmen of the bureaucracy proclaim that cooperative members dilute socialism, that people are not ready for democracy and glasnost, that multiple-candidate elections are virtually an attempt against Soviet power, and that the state must be run by professionals. It would be interesting to know who they are, these "professionals?"

Who is it that most often accuses the people of drunkenness, selfishness, and inability to accept changes? Those very same people! The bureaucratic ranks. If we were to believe them, everything in our country would end up in unbridled philistinism and democratic libertinism without their "professional" reins. At this point it would be appropriate to recall the writer who sarcastically remarked: I see too many liberators, I see no liberated people....

What is more, we are being threatened with unemployment. But who is issuing the threats? Once again, those who are firmly seated in their offices. But a good worker will always have a job, regardless of any staff cutbacks, while officialdom will have to be squeezed out. True enough, they have found a method to "reduce their numbers" at other people's expense. Members of the engineering and technical staff directly engaged in production complain that they are subjected to cutbacks while the managers' office positions remain unshaken.

No, say what you like, the bureaucracy in our country is still strong and inventive. You read reports on sessions and conferences and you yawn with boredom. The same old verbal monotony, self-praise, criticism from above, and professional speakers who are from time to time shifted around and moved about for the sake of quoting new names. Neither a profound economic-party analysis, nor any fresh ideas, nor a sign of worry about the country's fate....

Ivan Nikulshin, writer, Kuybyshev.

Let's Have Theses! [subhead]

I agree that the main point today is the cohesion of all forces of restructuring. Many people may dislike some individual aspects, the half-heartedness or even the contradictory nature of decisions being made. But now it is not a matter of shades of difference. Once the foundations of restructuring are consolidated during the conference, it will be possible to move on to a democratic discussion of the "hues" to be used to paint the walls of the new "edifice." The elections of delegates to the all-union conference must be political, rather than the conventional organizational elections—the difference in the respect is tremendous. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that we have lost the habit of political struggle, bringing into action the mass of party members relying on an even broader social base. To ensure the composition of delegates reflects the actual disposition of social forces, it is necessary to link the entire process of elections with a most profound and impartial analysis of restructuring at local level. Election meetings must adopt mandates of, if you like, platforms for delegates elected to attend the conference. They must contain a political program which must provide guidance for a party organization's delegation. The elaboration of such platform is not a simple matter, but the wheat can be separated from the chaff only in the course of open polemics.

The cause of consolidation could be helped by theses of CPSU Central Committee and the 19th all-union party conference. The publication of such theses would make it possible to more precisely and more specifically elaborate the political platforms for delegations.

I. Diskin, CPSU member since 1972.

Perfect Calm [subhead]

Having read two items in one issue of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA (No 43 dated 9 April 1988, the items being A. Gelman's article "Time for Mustering Forces" and [the letter entitled] "To Determine the Movie's Fate"), I decided to write this letter even though, frankly speaking, I am not at all sure that it will be published.

I profoundly believe that the ban on the showing of the movie "Impersonal Case" ["Nepersonalnoye Delo"] by Central Television is a logical episode in the struggle which the Odessa Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom has so successfully waged against critical remarks in the press during the last year.

Let me mention just the most blatant material that has been published recently and has failed to elicit the due response.

SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA (3 June 1987)—"Why Are the Captains Not Smiling?" It brought to light the deep rooted distortions in cadres work which resulted in the tragedy with the "Admiral Nakhimov." PRAVDA (13 September 1987, 25 January 1988, 19 February 1988)—"Intoxication with Power." The Central Committee organ raised the same question on three occasions, but the obkom's replies were couched in the "best traditions" of the stagnation times. The scandalous facts revealed by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in the article "One Storm After Another" led to a logical conclusion by means of a resolution by the CPSU Central Committee Central Auditing Commission. But the obkom still pretended that nothing was happening, as if the Prosecutor's Office and the party organs were located in different cities. And now we have the triumphant chords in this symphony of the obkom's struggle "to protect its reputation"—the ban on the showing of the aforementioned movie on Central Television.

In this context, one could legitimately ask: Could it be that the apparatus, the obkom apparatus in this case, is that link of "party bureaucracy" which promptly moves the invisible levers of power to ensure that the chain transmission of antirestructuring forces operates at full power, in this case along the Odessa-Kiev-Moscow line? Once again, certain people have no fear of any "storms" of restructuring, glasnost, and democracy.

How does this "telephone law" operate, who administers it in Kiev and Moscow if, even in April 1988 with the 19th party conference just around the corner, Central Television has been forced to retreat from the heights of glasnost and restructuring it had scaled?

Yu. Petukhov, 28, employee, Moscow.

Myths and Reefs [subhead]

The realization of the faulty ideology of restorers and the debunking of Stalinist myths constitute an important prerequisite for improving the social situation. An opportunity to do this is provided by an analysis of the platform of the opponents of restructuring.

One of the trumps constantly played by the ideologists of Stalinism is the "intrigues by the enemy." The enemy may change—be it yesterday's Trotskiyites, Bukharinites, kulaks and kulaks' henchmen, "bourgeois cosmopolitans," or "assassin physicians," or today's "left-wing liberals," "exposers" and "denigrators," "offspring of NEPmen, basmachis, and kulaks," "anti-people intellectuals," "counterrevolutionary nations," and so on. But the essence remains unchanged: The "enemy" is to blame for all our ills.

The custom of seeking the source of our society's contradictions in the intrigues by external enemies and their domestic agents is nothing new, and it was actually quite popular until recently. What happened was that all our contradictions and the problems stemming from them were always caused by the Evil One; in other words, they were inspired by the "enemy" and had no proper base for development in our country. In this way, our country was taken away from the mainstream of the world historical process and was turned into some sort of zone which was no longer subject to the universal laws of history and sociology. Our society was consequently deprived of its own driving force. Such a view did not at all fit within the framework of scientific world philosophy, but this actually did not bother our home-grown "Marxists" who had invented a new "historical law."

The identification of Stalin with socialism, the October Revolution, the motherland, and entire generations is another widespread method used by the opponents of restructuring. This method was successfully applied by Stalin himself and his propaganda apparatus, and it grew quite deep roots. This trick makes it possible to credit the butcher with the merits of his victims, to bury the dark in lightness and the crimes in heroism. This demagogical method is convenient for those who camouflage the forgery of history beneath "objective interpretation of the past." Coupled with the method of seeking out "enemies," it appears to guarantee "party-class positions."

There is another popular method—the rejection of the moral criterion when analyzing history and the present, the contraposition of the class and the moral approach (the latter being discredited as "scholasticism with ethical terms"). This method was duly assessed in Aleksandr Gelman's articles. Proceeding from relativist morality, it brands normal moral feelings as "subjectivism" and presents inhuman quasi-scientific "dialectics" as "objectivity" and "complete historic truth." The adherents of this method, adapting to circumstances, are even prepared to proclaim their "anger and indignation" caused by the mass repressions in the thirties and forties. But this proclamation remains nothing but an empty declaration, an example of pharisaical hypocrisy. The "anger and indignation" are saved up for those who take the liberty of raising their hands against the adored butcher, the organizer of the mass repressions. Any actual condemnation of them, the simplest human sympathy for innocent victims, are immediately classed as "abstract moralizing" (do you recall the "abstract humanism?"). There is not a single good word to be said about the victims of the terror. On the contrary, they are trampled into the mud as people who fully deserved everything that befell them in view of the fact that "the leaders at the time" were acting in an "historical virgin land" and were solving the question of "who will defeat whom?". Nobody is really to blame for the fact that the millions who died were just saplings in the forest which had to be cut down.

By fanning confrontation and deliberately misleading people, the opponents of restructuring are playing up to mass stereotypes and mental inertia, appealing to dark and unenlightened feelings, and reviving old fears. They operate not with proof but with symbols. But the utopian nature of their tenets does not render their demagoguery any less dangerous. This is why the struggle for the restoration of the Leninist meaning of socialism remains the most topical task of the present.

V. Ilyushenko, historian, Moscow.

Ruling Out Monopolies [subhead]

The filling of vacant top positions at all levels of the party and state leadership should be made on a competitive and elective basis. Lifelong "incumbency" in any post should be condemned once and for all as the height of immorality. The supreme soviets of the USSR and union republics should become really representative organs of legislative power in which ideas flourish, passions run high, and opinions collide—how could it be otherwise?!—and where all deputies are able to weigh matters up, discuss them, and air their own opinion during a really extensive and democratic discussion. In actual fact the USSR Supreme Soviet session lasts just 1 day.... Is this really a session? Clearly we should also change the status of deputies both in the center and locally. Many things should be changed... But probably the main thing is to demarcate power. It should be clearly and firmly established just who is who, and spheres of influence should be defined in this connection. Any monopoly on power should be ruled out. The resolution of these questions is long overdue and it is impossible to postpone them any longer. It is also time to make changes to our electoral system—a great deal has been said and written about this, but little has so far been done....

Many problems are still being solved impermissibly slowly, and there is still plenty of half-heartedness. We need iron consistency and unconquerable doggedness in implementing our plans.

V. Kuznetsov, CPSU member since 1944. Baranovichi, Brest Oblast.

[The following letter is published in facsimile form]

[Words illegible] Ref SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 7 April 1988, Gavriil Popov's article "There Is No Way Back."

Ref SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 9 April 1988, Aleksandr Gelman's article "Time for Mustering Forces."

Esteemed editor! What are you doing? They will be put inside.... But the things they write! Shocking!!! It reads like a prayer. O Lord, as long as they're not put inside! Put them under your control and don't lose sight of them—maybe everything will turn out.

T. Belyayeva, Leningrad.

We the Undersigned... [main subhead]

There Was None and Will Be None! [subhead]

Hello, Gelman! I have just read your essay "Time to Muster Forces" in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. You are clearly an educated man and you obviously have a good turn of phrase. But this is what I would say: The repressions of the thirties were justified. Because at the time there was a fifth column in our country (a nest of spies and subversives from the four corners of the globe, numbering tens of thousands of people), but since war with Germany was inevitable, Stalin had only one way out—taking sharp measures. Second: You said nothing at all about the party's leading role after Stalin. Third: Under a one-party dictatorship there was no democracy, there is none, and there can never be any. That is a fact.

N. Belenyshev, Orenburg.

"A Say for Everyone." But Whose Say? [subhead]

Is the Central Committee really unable to cope with renegades and ideological subversives? SOVETSKAYA KULTURA for 16 February this year featured an article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences L. Goldin entitled "A Say for Everyone, Glasnost for All." The article shows that its author is a hypocrite trying to pretend he is a naive person who does not understand the essence of highly important matters.

"A say for everyone," "the multiplicity of ideas and positions is our strength," "we must make it possible for as many people as possible to speak out in a principled way and adopt clear social positions"—these are the author's main ideas. Okay. But what about political and class interests in this multiplicity of social positions? Or the interests of socialist society, the Soviet people, the Communist Party?...

In militating for a multiplicity of ideas and positions Goldin nonetheless rejects from the outset participation in these ideas by "our home-grown witch-hunters." Why? Perhaps these hunters have found something deserving of attention? Let them have their say too. Nobody should be gagged. Flowers such as "Pamyat" should be allowed to bloom as well.

...Why should we not take account of a multiplicity of ideas and positions, or everyone's individual say? Just why is there this intolerance of different opinions? Why not consider the works of A. Rybakov as paranoid? Or the "works" of Pugacheva as spiritual prostitution? Or our contemporary rock music as an acoustic drug? Goldin writes about manifestations of "ossified thinking" in assessing the "dictatorship of the conscience." But who gave him the right to judge the multiplicity of opinions? Nobody should be gagged. Incidentally, the author for some reason fails to mention other dramatic "masterpieces" which also express "ossified" opinions. Perhaps these are the people who are really loosening the railroad tracks of socialism and carrying away the ties?

We should not think that readers will fail to understand the glaring, and to them vile and insulting, desire of a "specialist in the sphere of administrative theory" to use the cover of glasnost to peddle the concept—alien to Communist ideology—of a multiplicity of social positions.

As always in such articles, this is a deliberate distortion of commonly known facts. Goldin says that Stalin rejected the ability to cooperate in common work with "dissidents." As the doctor of sciences should know, the Trotskiyites and Zinovyevites had turned into a counterrevolutionary opposition, which for several years conducted continuous discussions and carried out antiparty and anti-Soviet acts, hypocritically stating all the while that they rejected factionalism. It was not Stalin but the 15th party congress that put an end to their activity. People should read documents before starting to write articles.

I would add this: Not all the enemies of the party and the people were crushed. Many survived and, when the time was right, had their revenge on those who had "offended" them, subjecting them to repression. Their descendants are now gunning for Stalin. Yes, he was guilty: He did not destroy all our enemies.

G. Matveyets, candidate of philosophical sciences. Moscow.

How Some People Are Studying the Lessons of History [subhead]

Why did society's spiritual degradation develop and progress so rapidly precisely in the post-Stalin period, when, to listen to hysterical cult-overthrowing Jews and their yes-men, opportunities were only just opening up for a spiritual "liberation" and flowering? How was it that the mass media, creative unions, and cultural and

enlightenment organs became active proponents of Western mass culture, aimed precisely at brainwashing, soul-destroying, and conning the people—young people above all?

...Among the responses organized by editorial bureaus on the activities of the "Pamyat" society there are often "killing" allusions to some kind of parallels with the Nazis. The aim here is not merely to intimidate by using a most odious label, but also to clearly impose this confrontational model of behavior.

It is well known, for instance, that the Nazis took very resolute measures against thieves, drug addicts, prostitutes, and so forth. Should we therefore place all this garbage on a pedestal, create, as it were, an advertising hubbub about it, write serious articles, make movies about it, hold interviews—in short, learn to live from them? Or, for instance, a report came in from the FRG that neo-Nazis had destroyed pornographic stores somewhere, this means, therefore, that we should open such stores and propagandize them.

Recently the newspapers and television, all at once and clearly on command, have started issuing calls to "review the image of the enemy." If it is a question of a present-day enemy, maybe there is some point in subjecting the image of yesterday's enemies to the same operation? And in analyzing more impartially just which combination of social and historical circumstances produced the despairing and suicidal resolve to challenge the whole world. Which factors made it possible for Germany to mobilize to such an extent an overwhelming majority of the people, to concentrate their wills and actions, and to develop such a propaganda and organizational capacity in such a short historical period? Was it evil ends alone? What place in these factors was played, for instance, by the legal restrictions on Jewish participation in sociopolitical life? In our country a precautionary veil of silence is drawn over not only the answers but even such questions themselves....

V. Samoylov, worker. Rostov-na-Donu.

Grist to Whose Mill... [subhead]

Many people, including Gelman, are vehement champions of rehabilitation. In rehabilitating people such as Bukharin, they point spiritedly—albeit surreptitiously—to the empty chair, an allegedly sacred place.... This is a dangerous conclusion, but it is "democratic".... But this, as they say, is just for starters—far more terrible is the sting in the tail that the author of the article has in store for us.... Yes, if our sacred Soviet people were like the party nucleus as depicted by Gelman, swastikas would today be flying over our long-suffering motherland!...

Before rising to attack a certain subject, it would not hurt to weigh things thoroughly, seriously, and in detail, provided, of course... It is not in vain that the proverb says "Look before you leap"! We are also taught this by Yu. Maksimov's beautiful article "Retouching a Tragedy?" in the 6 April LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

K. Sonina.

Enough "Repentance" [subhead]

The road of slandering the past and depicting it as somber and camp-like in its gloominess will not "lead us to the promised land" [privedet k khramu]. Of course, we should learn from the mistakes of the past, but not relish them.

Now more than ever, in the period of restructuring, we need an upsurge of patriotism, high spiritual sentiments, and revolutionary vigor! Yet we are all trying to repent! Enough of "Repentances" and "Children of the Arbat," enough of "Onward... Onward... Onward." Believe me, I have devoted my whole life to work with people and our army servicemen (more than 25 years now). These works do nothing for the cause of education, we will reap the bitter consequences of these "spicy" works. We should not be showing respected actresses having their blouses undone in the compartments of express trains (E. Ryazanov's "Station for Two") but showing the heroics of the Baykal-Amur Railroad, Afghanistan, and Chernobyl. We should teach certain cultural workers (E. Ryazanov, for instance) to respect people in uniform and their audiences. To be more modest and to value the past rather than knocking it. That is when we really will progress "Onward... Onward... Onward."

V. Stepanov, serviceman.

Letter Calls for Radical Party Reforms

PM021745 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 88 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Letter by V. Selivanov, deputy chief of administration at the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry and CPSU member since 1972, under the rubric "From the Discussion Mailbag: Addressed to the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "About the Party's Strength and Authority"—boldface and italics as published]

[Text] My letter to PRAVDA is prompted by the fact that, in my view, the press—whether deliberately or not—frequently avoids or touches only superficially on the paramount issue of restructuring: The question of the party's main driving force, of its authority and consequently its strength.

"The party is the mind, honor, and conscience of our epoch." Unfortunately, these words spoken by V.I. Lenin about the Bolshevik Party cannot be applied to all members of our party at present.

Following the victory of the October Revolution the party became a ruling party, and it was actively infiltrated by elements alien to it driven by careerist considerations. In the most difficult of conditions created by civil war, the restoration of the economy, and the struggle for the foundations of socialism, the party was losing its best representatives: They were the first to die in battles, they worked without sparing their health and energy.

Aware of the threat of its ranks' being swollen by fellow-travelers and careerists, the party took steps to purge its ranks and waged an active struggle for unity and against splits. But with the passage of time, the struggle for party unity and stability of the current leadership evolved into a struggle for unity and stability at any price, against any other opinion but the general secretary's opinion.

It was more convenient to do this by proclaiming an exacerbation of the class struggle and implanting myths about "spies" and mass "wrecking"—conditions allegedly "forcing" the imposition of secrecy on information and on the plans of the party and the country to protect them from the enemy and, to be on the safe side, from our own people.

The method of "label-tagging struggle" flourished in these conditions. Proclamations were made: This one is an enemy of the people, that one is a deviationist (left-wing or right-wing). There was active implantation of the idea that every party member is a soldier of the party, that it is up to the Central Committee leadership to lay down the line and to define what is correct and what is incorrect. The job of rank-and-file Communists was to unanimously approve and execute decisions. The opinion was implanted that the general secretary was always right and his words represented the ultimate truth, and therefore there was no need for any study of or research into social affairs. The only necessary thing was to correctly quote the leader.

K. Marx' thesis "Question everything" became dangerous. The sad experience of the best party members during the period of mass repressions in the thirties showed that attempts to question the correctness of I.V. Stalin were dangerous not only personally for those asking questions but also for their families. People were forced to profess a dual morality: one for the world in general, another for themselves and their very close friends.

Stalin's replacements—N.S. Khrushchev, and later L.I. Brezhnev—were unwilling to give up the power concentrated in their hands. The prevailing, stable system suited them perfectly. But the stability of the command system started applying the brakes to economic development. Enterprises functioned not on the basis of direct ties but in conditions of rigid centralization coupled with a vast growth of the range of articles produced, and this gave rise to a mass of parasitical organs. There were fewer and fewer producing bodies, against the steadily growing number of leadership, monitoring, coordinating, and pseudoscientific organs.

Ambitious "projects" were created, the people's money was wasted by the billions, but by the time of commissioning nobody was interested in the effectiveness of such expenditures because the next "project of the century" was already under way.

Essentially, the "rudimentary" reforms of the sixties produced nothing apart from confidence in the unlimited stability and durability of the system. Any hopes and illusions for renewal rapidly dispersed.

And what was the result? It was claimed that, since life was proving for the umpteenth time that, despite all good intentions, it cannot be built so as to be good for everyone, then let every man look after himself. Careerism, individualism, self-seeking, impunity, and drunkenness flourished lavishly and came out in the open. They overshadowed the communist revolutionary ideals. Career, awards, benefits, special services, proper connections, and a position among the leadership or distribution elite became the goals of a series of party members and their families. Clearly realizing this, they continued to utter from rostrums the lies they had learned by heart while ignoring the realities of life.

In the conditions of unanimous elections planned from above, the absence of leaders' removability or accountability to voters, and the absence of freedom of criticism it became possible for officials from the party, soviet, and state apparatus to fuse with workers in the trade network, law enforcement organs, and even criminals. Criminal clans like Odilov's were being created.

Arrogance, incompetence, and bribery—the enemies of socialism of which V.I. Lenin spoke with bitterness and misgiving—became widespread. The humiliation of working people struggling for justice and the absence of control over princelings who had overstepped the mark diminished many people's sense of their own dignity and made them lose their faith in justice. After all, our failures and errors are primarily the failures of our party and our Central Committee, of every party member.

After all, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Chernobyl have their party organizations which knew of the impending disasters and kept silent. Why? Simply because some party leader perceived elected office as the next mandatory rung up the career ladder, knowing that careers depended on the bosses and relations with them must not be damaged. A triple morality became the rule: I say one thing at meetings, I think something else, and I do something differently from both of them.

The rule for a considerable number of party members was: Personal affairs to start with, then collective affairs (at enterprise or institution level), then at sector level, and only afterward, if nothing stood in the way, could there be

any question of all-party and all-state affairs. And yet, almost everyone applying for admission to the party wrote: "I want to join the front ranks of fighters for communism."

And what happened? As long as you attended party meetings, paid your membership dues, and asked no unnecessary questions, you could expect a quiet life and exemplary assessment reports and had a real chance of advancing in office. Mediocrity and noninvolvement started to predominate. Talent was dangerous! There was no point in envying Communists who strove to live in conformity with the Statutes or to adhere to the party Program. Communists who perceived the mistakes, criticized, suggested changes, and upheld state interests and justice. These people were disliked and feared by the leadership, and this is why even now people in some places would eagerly grasp the slightest pretext to get rid of them or to settle accounts with them. But they are also often enough disliked by the "collective," which still finds it more convenient to live in peace, without any noise (without commissions and inspections), while silently cursing its own bosses.

A large number of lovers of truth were galvanized into action by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th party congress. This was, of course, only a beginning.

The administrative edict system based on personal loyalty to the boss rather than to the cause, the system whereby "share depends on rank," the wage leveling, the constant shortage of goods, the ineffectiveness and sluggishness of the law toward thieves, parasites, and squanderers—all these did their terrible work: They implanted slavish respect for career, official standing, and the elite, instituted disrespect for skilled, honest, conscientious, and creative labor, and rendered hack work in all its varieties a mass phenomenon.

The result of this system was that many workers had no pride in their job, speciality, or skill; enterprises had no pride in their brand name or the quality of their output, and everyone was up in arms against any upward revision of plans or orders. It was no longer a shame to work badly, and those who received unearned money were even envied. The standards of proper life declined, there were no criteria, there were few positive examples. It is not only a pity that our art has produced few positive heroes, it is a pity that few of them exist in real life while those that do exist have been so battered by life at times that nobody would wish to emulate them. So far there have been few people like Travkin, Ilizarov, and Fedorov. This is particularly bad when it comes to educating young people, because young people need them most of all.

For the time being—judging by brand name labels on young people's clothing and footwear, by sports equipment, and by television programs for young people—Western firms and Western "heroes" are streets ahead.

The Komsomol is in a difficult position. Its main misfortune is that it has copied the work of party organs. Therefore, almost all complaints against it can also be addressed to our party leadership.

Here is another question. Leaders who are not party members have been an extreme rarity. If you wanted to be in charge you had to join the party. Since leadership meant engineering and technical staff, while the percentage of workers in the party had to be maintained, demandingness toward workers applying to join the party declined: Just show willingness and you would become a member.

The party ranks and, we were assured, the "party influence" grew and grew to reach 19 million members. During the stagnation period in the seventies I heard it said that intellect, conscience, and party-mindedness were at times incompatible in these conditions. Indeed, many outstanding specialists turned down promotions to party work.

While in military aviation, I heard it said: "An intelligent instructor, excellent flier, good candidate for flight commander; the other man is a weakling but he is quiet and disciplined—he'll do as deputy commander for political work." I consider that the "apotheosis" of such work was the notorious order by Aviation Commander in Chief Kutakhov on deputy commanders for political work. Following a series of crashes for which they were to blame, the rules were changed: Deputy commanders for political matters were not to be appointed group leaders, they were not to be allowed to do any instruction work, and their flying duty was to be planned for the most favorable conditions. The joke then went: "What is the difference between a commander and a deputy commander for political work? The commander says: 'Do as I do.' The deputy commander for political work says: 'Do as I tell you.'"

The selection of by no means the best specialists for party work, the divergence between words and action, the formalism in socialist competition, in drawing up personal plans, and in personal assessment reports, and mindless transcription of classics and study of issues "in light of decisions" were the norm of party life for a long time. Individual work with Communists was replaced by work with "the masses"—lectures, summaries, posters, and mainly reports on work done.

Life was not easy for party workers who strove to do their work honestly and to help people. They frequently had to to engage in "double bookkeeping," with one set of books for actual work and another for reports, while the main point in these conditions was to set an example of conscientious service so that people would have faith in them regardless of all else.

Hypercentralization was another calamity. Essentially, it means weakness, inaction, and lack of will by party organs at the grass roots. What petty bosses feared most of all was to incur the anger of their superiors, whereas

they had absolutely nothing to fear from their subordinates' disrespect. The mass of questions which consequently remained unresolved at local level periodically surfaced in letters to the Central Committee. It so happened, however, that you would demand a reply to your letter and you would be told: "We do not give written replies; people write too much."

You would complain to a Politburo member about the defects in intersector relations, and a reply would come from a section chief who would make no decision without the minister, just as the minister would make no decision without him. You would demand that a conference be convened to look into things—the conference would be convened but the questions would often be deliberately evaded. Moreover, commissions to investigate letters would more often than not include people who were the subject of criticism or their subordinates, with access to it refused to the complainant. Even in the period of restructuring, the actions by high-level organs display overtones of the old attitudes: Let's "close the file" by any means: The cause and progress can wait.

Briefly speaking, this is the same old officialdom sickness—fear for one's position, especially if it has been held for a long time. Someone would raise a question, and he would be asked: Why did he not take any steps earlier, why did he not report it, why did he not do something about it? The applicant would then be duped with empty promises.

Many shortcomings would come to light if we were to look at ideological work. The informal "Pamyat" association offers a good example of helplessness. The noise that the press has made! Yet Moscow has thousands of full-time propaganda and agitation workers and countless deputies for ideological work.... Here is their field for action—speak, persuade people; but no, they are afraid! Once again, just as in the good old days, they complain and beg: "Do not allow," ban, close down. Some ideological workers are "strong" only with those who do not argue with them and, more often than not, do not even listen to them.

The paramount question of restructuring is the democratization of society, and it cannot be implemented without democratization of the party. What are we used to? We elect delegates to the rayon conference, that conference elects delegates to the next one up, and so on up to the congress and the Central Committee. Take the congress: Central Committee accountability report, debate, basic guidelines, resolution, notification of party organizations, unanimous approval. After this you hear it said: "The party decided," "the party announces," "the party solemnly proclaims." It is clearly necessary to say more precisely what was decided by the congress, what by the Central Committee, and what by the Politburo; as for saying that the party has decided something, this can evidently be done when the Central Committee accountability report and the proposals are distributed among party organizations, which discuss them, add something to them, and adopt them.

In this context, I would like the following proposals for enhancing the party's prestige to be discussed:

There must be certification of every Communist. For this purpose, labor collectives must widely discuss the work of Communists on fulfilling the party Program and Statutes and must use secret ballots to determine whether he deserves the right to be a CPSU member. To prevent this work sliding down the familiar path of exchanging party documents, Lenin's principle must be applied in life: Rather have 10 workers not being party members than 1 chatterbox as a party member. Even a noticeable reduction of the party's numerical strength would only enhance its authority. After all, 300,000 Bolsheviks were sufficient in October 1917! Just a few million proper Communists will be sufficient for restructuring. The procedure and time schedule for recertification of party members ought to be defined;

Party organizations which have committed serious mistakes in their work, or which have known about crimes but have failed to take measures to prevent them, should be disbanded by a Central Committee resolution and their members should undergo emergency recertification;

A recommendation must be made that the new edition of the Criminal Code should provide that party membership is a circumstance aggravating the guilt in the event of a premeditated breach of the law;

At least 200 workers and best specialists, winners of the all-union professional competition and nominated by meetings of major labor collectives, should be included in the Central Committee membership;

Changes should be introduced in the procedures for discussion of questions at meetings, conferences, and congresses. Information and basic guidelines should be initially made available in written form, they should then be discussed, and only then should there be a speech by a leader with a draft of the general decision or resolution. This will make it possible to expand initiative and reduce the pressure of authority;

Direct elections of raykom, gorkom, and obkom first secretaries by secret ballot should be introduced, and maximum limits should be set for the holding of elected office;

Electability should be introduced for editors of party newspapers and journals;

A mandatory minimum of signatures should be introduced for letters (addresses), without which a letter (address) cannot be published or examined by a party organ. Exclusion zones for criticism should be abolished everywhere;

Every Communist must be notified of all primary information about plenums, whether unclassified or classified. If a report is classified (secret), a declassification date for the document in question must be indicated. Information on the expenditure of party funds must be made available to Communists;

There should be discussion of the question of leaving a proportion of party dues at the disposal of primary party organizations (often there are no funds for posters or brochures, and I know of cases in which there has been no money and nobody to bury a Communist who lived alone);

There should be an increase in the apparatus of aides to the general secretary of the Central Committee for work with letters concerning the activity of the top leadership and monitoring organs and on the most important questions of state. In the work with letters, and in the event of a complaint being justified, a decision should be made to punish representatives of the body which should have made the decision but failed to do so, and this should be mandatorily publicized in the press.

I think that an open [glasnoye] discussion of these and a series of other questions will help to choose correct paths in party work, will enhance our party's authority, and will really boost its leading role in restructuring.

V. Selivanov, deputy chief of administration at the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry, CPSU member since 1972

Moscow

Individuals' Ideas on Reforms, Media Coverage

PM290839 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian
28 Apr 88 p 1

["Opinions" feature by "rubric duty editors" A. Gasparyan and M. Simonova quoting individuals' telephoned comments on a variety of topics]

[Excerpts] About the 19th Party Conference [subhead]

S. Obednin, CPSU member since 1961, Dubna:

I propose that proceedings at the forthcoming party conference be broadcast live on television. In this way the people will participate in its work to a certain extent and will be able to assess every delegate's speech on its own merit. I think this would be a mirror of glasnost. [passage omitted]

About an Article in the Weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY (No 17, April 1988) [subhead]

M. Kobrin, Moscow:

The newspaper reported in particular that Western special services intend to focus their "main efforts" on "the dissemination of **provocative fabrications** [boldface as published] (my emphasis—M.K.) about the emerging and growing resistance to restructuring." It is no secret for anyone that the Washington "cloak and dagger knights" and their "dirty work" colleagues in Bonn and Paris have tried and will try to sow doubts and mistrust in restructuring. But the readers of this very popular Soviet publication could easily get the impression that in reality there are no adversaries of the renewal of socialism and those who think otherwise are nothing but simpletons who have let foreign radio voices twist them around their little fingers.... [passage omitted]

About Examinations on History of the USSR and the CPSU [subhead]

I. Goryunov, Mosrentgen, Moscow Oblast;

The old view of the history of the USSR and the CPSU, based on I. Stalin's "Short Course," is finally discredited. A new concept of history, conforming with the critical reinterpretation of past experience, has not yet been developed. How are school pupils and students to answer questions on collectivization, industrialization, Stalin's repressions, the initial state of the Great Patriotic War, and so on? Should examinations on these topics not be postponed until such time as our historians and ideologists themselves manage to finally answer these question and earn "excellent" grades for their answers?

About the Discussion Around I. Stalin [subhead]

M. Ilyushchenko, Alma-Ata:

The arguments conducted in the press about Stalin are reminiscent of scholastic discussions. What kind of argument can we have when statistical data about the famine during the collectivization, the repressions, and the rehabilitations of the fifties are still secret, and if instead of documents we are reading novels and plays?

The publication of these documents and the broad access to them for readers would render arguments about Stalin's personality more objective and, I hope, would render impossible any return to different forms of tyranny and repression under whatever guise.

About a Memorial Plaque [subhead]

A. Suleymanyan, history teacher, Moscow:

Now we know that L.I. Brezhnev was not an "outstanding figure of the world communist movement." Everyone knows how he became four times Hero of the Soviet Union. I therefore propose that the present plaque

be taken down and replaced by a new one reading: "Here lived L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee." This would be fair and honest. [passage omitted]

About A. Barsov's Letter "Order or 'Order'?" (SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 16 April) [subhead]

T. Morozova, Moscow:

I disagree with the author that freedom of speech should be denied to the opponents of freedom of speech. Everyone must have an opportunity to have his say. By prohibiting even the most odious and antidemocratic opinions we would be driving people's thinking underground and would be unable to monitor it. But the thoughts remain and, when there is no monitoring by public opinion, the champions of antidemocracy find it easier to consolidate their forces.

Rubric duty editors A. Gasparyan and M. Simonova; Telephone No 214-61-22

Crimean Tatars' Resettlement To Begin Early May

LD021604 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1210 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] At the State Labor Committee of the Uzbek SSR and the republic's working commission of representatives of Crimean Tatars

A joint session of representatives of the State Labor Committee and the republic's working commission was held in Tashkent today. It studied the composition of persons from the numbers of Crimean Tatars for an organized resettlement in Crimea Oblast. The first group of citizens of Crimean Tatar nationality will leave for Crimea Oblast at the beginning of May. They will take part in the building of housing for their families. The republican and oblast commissions, together with reesentatives of the republic's State Labor Committee, are continuing work on selection of families for organized resettlement in rural areas of the Crimea.

Arkalyk Airline Incident Ends Safely

LD022128 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 2 May 88

[Text] A TU-154 aircraft making regular flights between Alma-Ata, Arkalyk, and Moscow was ready for take-off from Arkalyk airport when a militia team, which had been sent for, had to board the airliner. These emergency measures were needed to pacify military construction officer Bogomolov. The brave captain started a noisy argument with the air hostesses because his seat in the passenger cabinet appeared to be occupied. He categorically refused to take the next seat, which was empty, and threatened to blow up the plane, claiming a mine had been placed on board.

The engines had to be stopped, and more than 130 passengers had to disembark so that the cabinet could be searched for the second time. Nothing suspicious was found, however, and the TU-154 continued on its flight, minus Bogomolov, naturally. The airliner landed safely at Domodedovo Airport, although 2 and 1/2 hours later than scheduled.

As to the apprehended person, he said it was a joke. A medical check of the joker has led to the conclusion that in all probability he took strong drugs. The competent bodies are investigating the incident.

Khrushchev Son on Father's Treatment, Memoirs

LD301720 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1545 GMT 30 Apr 88

["Khrushchev Son's Interview to Yugoslav Daily"—TANJUG headline]

[Text] Zagreb, April 30 (TANJUG)—I hope that Mikhail Gorbachev succeeds where my father did not, because there is no alternative to changes and perestroyka, Sergey Khrushchev, Nikita Khrushchev's son, told the Yugoslav Daily VIJESNIK.

My father was the first "to shake" the Soviet bureaucratic society. He dared to unmask Stalin, start economic reforms and democratization and urge a dialogue with the United States on curbing the arms race, Sergey Khrushchev said in what was his first interview to a foreign journalist. If my father had not begun then, 33 years ago, it would be more difficult for Gorbachev now, he added.

On Gorbachev's recent visit to Yugoslavia, Khrushchev said that he was pleased that after such a long time a Soviet delegation made such an important visit to the country to which Stalin did so much harm.

My father knew that the accusations against Yugoslavia and Tito were pure fabrication and that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had to apologize for that, Khrushchev said. It was tragically shameful that Stalin raised his ruthless sword at his Yugoslav friends, who had just ended their heroic war, and called them fascist agents, he said.

Nikita Khrushchev, who knew Tito was right because Stalin's socialism was nothing but sheer dictatorship, had to fight strong resistance in the Politburo to go to Belgrade in 1955 and apologize to the Yugoslav leaders for the mistakes made, Sergey Khrushchev said. That was not easy because he was surrounded by Stalin's closest aides—Molotov, Suslov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov—who were directly involved in bringing in an indictment against Yugoslavia, he recalled.

Nikita Khrushchev highly respected Tito for being "the first to defy Stalin, which drove him crazy," Sergey Khrushchev said. This impressed my father and he always respected Tito's independent thinking when occasional disagreements occurred, he added.

Speaking about the closed session of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party at which Khrushchev submitted a report on Stalin's crimes, Sergey Khrushchev said that this move prompted Stalin's aides and followers to plot against his father, but their plan did not succeed. Soon after that the report was published in the West, but not yet in the Soviet Union. Sergey Khrushchev said he believed that the report will be made public soon because everything his father talked about is now openly discussed in the Soviet Union.

My father and his friend Anastas Mikoyan knew one month in advance what was in store for him, Sergey Khrushchev said speaking about Nikita Khrushchev's removal from office, adding that they did not know when exactly it was going to happen. When Suslov telephoned my father, who at the time was on holiday at the Black Sea, and told him to return immediately for a Politburo session on agriculture, he knew what it was all about but he had no choice.

The Politburo session lasted three days and during that time my (?father did) not come home. When he did, he was crushed but at the same time happy. He was tired of everything and he seemed to have realized that he could not run his head against the wall, Khrushchev said. As for Leonid Brezhenv's behaviour towards Nikita Khrushchev at the session and later, Sergey Khrushchev said it was inhuman. My father always behaved correctly towards Brezhnev. He brought him to the Kremlin, but Brezhnev leant towards those who conspired against Khrushchev—Sergey Khrushchev said.

After removal from the office, my father was practically isolated—hardly anyone (?visited him), and they were [words indistinct] too. It was not clear whether they were (?there to guard) him or watch (?with whom he) was meeting and what he was doing, Khrushchev's son said. When my father died, the daily PRAVDA mentioned it in three lines, saying only that "meritorious pensioner Nikita Sergeievich Khrushchev" died, and nobody officially bade him farewell at the funeral, Sergey Khrushchev said, adding in a clipped tone that this was all that could have been expected from PRAVDA, Brezhnev and Suslov at the time.

On Nikita Khrushchev's memoirs, which he wrote after being removed from office and which have never been published in the Soviet Union, Sergey Khrushchev underlined that allegations spread by the CIA about their being a forgery were a fabrication of Brezhnev's and Suslov's propaganda. I believe that my father's memoirs will eventually be published and I am working on that, he said.

I see no reason why special mention should be made about my father's rehabilitation, because he was never accused of any specific mistakes. My father was rebuked, and still is, for "voluntarism and rashness," although no one is quite certain what that actually means, Khrushchev's son said.

Sharper Line Between Success, Failure Urged

PM291035 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Feature under the general heading: "Following up Letters'...Not for Publication""]

[Excerpts] In the 2 months that this rubric has been in existence readers have become used to it. Many people have been sending to this feature letters on acute problems which previously were not usually discussed in public. Others dispute points raised by the writers of letters previously published under the "...Not for Publication" rubric [passage omitted]

The Carrot and the Stick [subhead]

The letter from I. Otchyuchenko, (IZVESTIYA No 35), who believes that everything in our country will remain as it was unless there is a possibility of becoming wealthy, raises an important problem. The high quality and great quantity of goods and services in the industrially developed West and Japan, as well as the labor productivity which is superior to ours, are due to the two diametrically opposed factors there: the possibility of becoming rich and, conversely, the possibility of financial ruin. Of course, only a few manage to become millionaires, but the law and social morality are no obstacle to unlimited wealth. Those people who can't stand the pace of competition for various reasons (for example, if they are lazy, stupid, drunkards, or drug addicts) immediately slide in the other direction—toward bankruptcy and poverty. And the law there, just like social morality, does not prevent that from happening. It is the principle of Pushkin's hero: Let the loser weep.

It is the other way around in our country. The law and social morality do not allow the individual to become infinitely wealthy or poor. Whatever else it does, Soviet law does at least feed people and does not leave the failure to freeze. Humanitarianism—that is good. But sometimes all sorts of mistakes are disregarded in its name. The difference between the stick and the carrot in our country is not great. Our carrot is not very sweet, but compared with the scourge of unemployment the stick is little more than a silk ribbon. If a drunkard is thrown out of one plant he becomes a loader at the supermarket. There's our "stick" for you!

Now, when we are making the transition from socialism by injunction and administration to economic socialism, when self-capitalization and economic accountability are being introduced, the two alternative incentives must

be made sharper—the failure must begin to suffer whereas the energetic go-getter should be offered huge, enticing incentives. We should not slavishly imitate Western models, but nor should we reduce everything to moral incentives.

V. Vinogradov, Tula. [passage omitted]

Estonian Economic Management Plan Approved

LD301638 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Text] Tallinn April 30 TASS—The new master scheme for the management of Estonia's national economy, approved at a meeting of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, was prompted by the need to bring economic management in line with the demands of perestroyka (drive for restructuring), Bruno Saul, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Estonia, said in a TASS interview which centered on the substance of the new scheme.

The scheme is based on three principles, the head of the republic's government went on. The all-important one is a compact nature of management. There are 43 ministries in Estonia for the present and the number of republican management bodies, many of which have a multi-link system, runs into about one hundred. As a result, the management staff makes up two per cent of all employees in the republic.

The new scheme provides for reducing it by 25 percent. We want to set up complex, compact management bodies: state committees on industry, transport, culture, national education, etc. This will be enough, for part of the management functions were transferred to plants and associations themselves under the Law on the State Enterprise.

The second principle logically stems from the first one—enhancing the role of the local government bodies - soviets of people's deputies (councils) - in the management of the economy in their territories. And finally, the third principle—preserving the formed territorial structure of the national economy.

Responding to a question on how the new master management scheme was developed, Bruno Saul said that to this end a special commission was set up. It took the commission half a year to draw up the proposals. At a later stage, groups of deputies and standing commissions of Estonia's Supreme Soviet joined in the work. The draft was discussed and adopted in the republic and, yesterday, was approved at the meeting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. Now the scheme should be worked out in detail. It is to define the structure and competence of each new management body and then the management scheme will be ready for being put into practice.

Economic

Statistical Offices' Reporting Questioned

PM280959 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Yu. Rytov "Topic of the Day": "Better Early Than Never"]

[Text] Glasnost, reliability, and promptness—these surely are main demands on statistical information today. We still remember a time when statistics were full of "gaps" and when they contained areas off limits not only to criticism but also to the simple provision of information to people... How is the restructuring of the statistical service proceeding and how is it responding to the needs of the times?

A detailed discussion of this was held at a news conference organized by the USSR State Committee for Statistics on 25 April. Journalists were given an account of the results of the national economy's work in the 1st quarter of 1988 and also of the measures which are being taken to improve cooperation between statistical organs and the mass media.

Then the questions came thick and fast. Each question to some extent touched on the "openness" of statistical information and the "gaps" still existing in it.

There is no denying that the changes in the working of the statistical service are clear to see. Virtually every day, for example, our editorial office receives press releases. These contain information characterizing the course of the most important economic and social processes. More thorough and detailed socioeconomic comparisons are being carried out with other countries on a vast range of indicators.

It is important to note that this work is not based on the expansion of statistical reports but, on the contrary, on a reduction of it. Compared with 1985 the amount of official reports was reduced by a factor of five and last year by 23 percent.

The State Committee for Statistics has been charged with the responsibility for ensuring the reliability of information and for combating misrepresentation and distortion. That work is proceeding apace. Last year alone, for instance, more than 15,000 officials were prosecuted for distortion of statistics.

That much is so. But why are so many complaints (and, I believe, fair complaints) being made by journalists against our statistical service? Why, for example, does the State Committee for Statistics still not present for publication information such as the population's minimum living standard? Why do they still not calculate the price of the "shopping basket" (the range of essential goods and services for families on various incomes) but instead determine the family budget based on average

figures as in the past? Why does our respected statistical service still not show the real increase in prices (not a price index but the actual prices)?

The answer given was not very precise: Work is now under way, it was said...

There was another factor which surprised me personally: The date of the news conference which discussed the results of the country's development in the 1st quarter was 25 April! On that very same day, the same question was being examined at a session of the USSR Council of Ministers, where the results of the 1st quarter's work were being authoritatively assessed.

As the proverb has it: Better Late Than Never. However, such a rule is hardly applicable to the provision of timely statistical information. I say this with great concern because many press releases go unused for the reason that they contain outdated information. A daily newspaper cannot give its readers the day before yesterday's news!

Our statistical service can no longer hide behind the screen of average figures. Analysis of profound economic processes—including at the enterprise level. Analysis of profound social phenomena—including that which takes account of the characteristics of various social groups. That is what we expect from statistical information today. And promptness, of course: Better Early Than Never.

Presidium Resolution Surveys Proposals, Comments
PM281141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Apr 88 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; On Results of the Examination of the Proposals and Comments by the Chambers' Permanent Commissions and by Deputies Submitted at the USSR Supreme Soviet Seventh and Eighth Sessions"]

[Text] As has already been reported, at its session the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium discussed the question of the results of the examination of the proposals and comments by the chambers' permanent commissions and deputies submitted at the USSR Supreme Soviet seventh and eighth sessions. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium took into consideration the USSR Council of Ministers report and the coreport of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Budget and Planning Commissions on this question.

The resolution notes that the USSR Government, the USSR ministries and departments, and the union republic councils of ministers examined the proposals and comments by the chambers' permanent commissions and deputies and are implementing measures to implement them in the work they are performing on restructuring the management of the national economy and fulfilling the plan and budget for 1988.

In accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum and the seventh session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, a radical economic reform is being implemented, as is the transition of enterprises and organizations to full economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet], self-financing, and self-management. More active use is being made of reserves for raising production efficiency. Qualitative indicators of work are being improved.

In the 1st quarter of this year the growth of industrial output compared with the corresponding period last year was 5 percent. Contract commitments for deliveries of output for industry as a whole were fulfilled 99.2 percent as against 97.8 percent in the 1st quarter of 1987.

The social orientation of the economy's development is being intensified. There has been a considerable increase in the commissioning of apartment blocks and establishments in the sociocultural sphere. The average wages of workers and employees and the remuneration of kolkhoz members in the public economy are increasing. The sale of food and industrial consumer goods to the population is growing.

At the same time, the resolution notes, the USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers have allowed grave omissions in preparing for the introduction of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), in transferring enterprises and organizations to full economic accountability and self-financing, and in switching to predominantly economic methods of management in accordance with the requirements of the new economic mechanism.

There have been shortcomings in notifying enterprises of the basic data for forming economic and social development plans for 1988. The volumes and composition of state orders have been expanded unjustifiably. In a number of cases they are not backed up by the necessary material resources. Economic normatives often fail to accord with the demands of the USSR law on the close link between general state interests and enterprises' economically accountable interests and the interest of workers. The USSR Ministry of Agricultural and Tractor Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool Building, and several other ministries are failing to observe the demands on normatives' stability.

Enterprises are often slack in performing work on assimilating the new economic mechanism, activating the labor collectives on the basis of the democratization of management, introducing economic accountability within the production facility, and bringing it to every working person.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium believes there are serious shortcomings in the fulfillment of the state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR.

Stable and steady work in fulfilling the set targets is not being ensured. A considerable number of enterprises and organizations is failing to cope with contract commitments.

There has been no radical breakthrough in work to introduce the achievements of science and technology into production. The USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy is failing to ensure the fulfillment by the enterprises under its jurisdiction of the plans for producing highly efficient types of metal output while the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry is failing to ensure the production of a number of new types of progressive materials. Work on stepping up the regime of thrift and resource saving is not being performed actively enough. Secondary resources are being brought into economic circulation only feebly.

The investment process is being restructured intolerably slowly. The dissipation of efforts and funds on numerous construction sites is continuing. In the majority of cases normative deadlines for installing projects are not being observed. The volumes of uncompleted construction and stocks of uninstalled equipment are growing. The councils of ministers of a number of union republics are failing to pay due attention to construction sites of all-union importance.

The situation is untoward regarding the fulfillment of targets for commissioning preschool institutions, vocational and technical colleges, hospitals, and several other projects of the sociocultural sphere. The commissioning of residential homes for the elderly and invalids is not being ensured.

The development of the production of consumer goods and services lags behind the plans adopted, which is seriously complicating the money circulation situation in the country. Enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Light Industry are failing to fulfill the state order for woollen textiles. The range of items produced by the sector remains narrow and their quality is showing virtually no improvement. Last year the enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and the USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry were greatly in arrears in deliveries of consumer goods. In the 1st quarter of this year the enterprises of the USSR Ministry of Heavy, Power, and Transport Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, the Ministry of Construction in the Southern Regions of the USSR, and a number of others failed to cope with consumer goods production plans.

The plans for the development of paid services to the population are not being fulfilled in the Uzbek SSR, the Kazakh SSR, Azerbaijan SSR, Tajik SSR, and several other union republics.

The ministries and departments are failing to render the necessary aid to enterprises in developing foreign economic activity, building up their export potential, and expanding direct ties with foreign enterprises and firms. The USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry, and several others are allowing violations of the discipline of supplies of output for export.

The attention of the USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers was drawn to the fact that they have still not taken the necessary steps for a radical improvement of the standard of economic work, the normalization of the financial position of sectors and regions, each enterprise's fulfillment of plans for profit and payments into the budget, and the reduction of the prime cost of output.

The financial position of many enterprises and organizations remains complex and in a number of cases is even deteriorating. Parasitical sentiments have not been overcome in many economic leaders. The losses of enterprises which work badly often continue to be covered at the expense of those which work well, which is intolerable under the conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing.

For 1988 state enterprises have approved profit plans on smaller scales than envisaged in the State Plan, in connection with which the fulfillment of the set targets for USSR State Budget revenue receipts is not being ensured.

The restructuring of the banking system has been dragged out, as has the restructuring of credit and accounting services for enterprises and organizations.

The USSR Council of Ministers has been recommended to consistently steer a line toward introducing the new economic mechanism into practice and to strictly observe the principles of full economic accountability, self-financing, and self-management. They must improve the system of economically accountable relations and work persistently to introduce the cost-cutting mechanism.

The adoption of the provision on the state order and the solution of questions connected with forming a system of long-term economic normatives on a scientific basis must be accelerated. The dependence of the sides' material responsibility on the size of the loss caused by violations of contract commitments must be stepped up.

During the fulfillment of the plan and budget for 1988 and in preparing the plan and budget for 1989 special attention must be paid to the accountable organs' ensuring the accelerated introduction into production of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, fundamentally restructuring the investment process, commissioning production capacities and projects in the sociocultural sphere on schedule, increasing the production of

consumer goods and services in accordance with the population's effective demand, increasing the effectiveness of foreign economic relations, and building up export potential, above all through machinery and equipment.

Exactingness must be stepped up regarding USSR ministries and departments and union republic councils of ministers for improving the standard of economic work, normalizing the financial position of enterprises and organizations, fulfilling state budget commitments, and taking fuller consideration in practical activity of the proposals and comments of the chambers' permanent commissions and deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The union and autonomous republics' Supreme Soviet Presidiums and councils of ministers have been asked to complete as rapidly as possible the restructuring of the structure of management and the reduction of its apparatus. They must eliminate more actively formal bureaucratic methods and a style of work based on administrative commands.

Effective steps must be taken to further galvanize the activity of the local soviets of people's deputies in the solution of tasks of the comprehensive economic and social development of the territories under their jurisdiction, in the all-around development and support of the initiative of labor collectives, and in the use of reserves for the fuller satisfaction of the population's requirements for food and consumer goods and services, for the expansion of housing construction, and for the consolidation of the social sphere's material and technical base.

Consumption's Role in Development Analyzed

PM261437 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Apr 88 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences L. Vid with unattributed commentary: "How To Avoid the 'Self-Consuming' Economy? We Continue the Discussion of Vasiliy Selyunin's Article 'The Rate of Growth "Measured Against Consumption" ' (5 January 1988)"—boldface as published]

[Text] The rate of economic growth and the proportions of the development of our national economy... These questions are more important than ever now because the fate of socialism, the prestige of our society in the world arena, and the prosperity of each of us depend on them. No wonder that V. Selyunin's article prompted this response.

The 27th CPSU Congress put it like this: There must be a move toward a new quality of economic growth. That is why we are now going through an intensive phase in which restructuring is destroying the existing principles, stereotypes, and priorities.

Must there be such a rate everywhere? The ideology of the new quality demands that it be ensured in those places where it accelerates the national economy's transfer to an intensive path of development. In many areas growth is unnecessary. In some it is even harmful.

Let us take just one major example from the 11th 5-Year Plan, which graphically illustrates the negative role of growth rates. During that period national income rose by 19.2 percent while stocks of various resources, equipment, and consumer goods increased—note—by 44 percent. In industry those stocks increased almost twice as quickly as the rise in output production itself. In agriculture it was three times.

Such rates in the growth of stocks have caused the state's ruin. But worst of all is that this was a matter of indifference to those who were overstocked. They did not become rich, nor were they ruined.

This trend is now actively being eradicated. Until quite recently we were rescued by the socially unjustified turnover tax on the sale of alcoholic beverages and the accelerated exploitation of unique oil and gas deposits. Now we cannot make use of those sources of national income growth. Further mighty efforts are needed to ensure the economy's full transfer to new socially justified rates.

In more concrete terms the new quality of growth may be examined using the example of the development of a number of sectors. For example, we fell roughly as many trees as the United States. But from the same quantity of wood the Americans produce 3-3.4 times more timber than we do. To avoid increasing the felling of timber and at the same time to satisfy the national economy's needs, it is absolutely essential that the retooling of existing enterprises in the timber, pulp, and paper industry be carried out at a high rate in conjunction with the development of machine building and the chemical industry. It is necessary to create fundamentally new production units for the thorough processing of timber. Only the aroma of pine needles, leaves, and sawdust must be left unused—all the rest must be used to produce various types of end product, as in all the developed countries.

Let us take an example from another sector. Only a small proportion of the aircraft in the civil aviation fleet today meet modern requirements for fuel consumption per passenger-kilometer. And until the work of replacing the aircraft fleet with new, economical machines is completed, it will be difficult to increase shipment volumes. After all, oil refining is stabilizing, so the increase in aircraft fuel will be considerably less.

The situation is similar in ferrous metallurgy, where it is possible to meet the economy's needs by producing efficient types of metal products on the basis of retooling the final process stage and introducing continuous steel casting machinery on a large scale.

Thus it is perfectly clear that today acceleration is not to be viewed simply in terms of increasing production volumes. The strength and support of the new concept of acceleration lie in the restructuring of all spheres of social production and the efficient development of the entire economy, with priority given to the development of machine building.

Now for another important problem broached by V. Selyunin—**the ratio of accumulation to consumption in national income.**

In the past 15 years (1971 through 1985) there was a decline in the growth of national income and of the consumption and accumulation funds. Furthermore, the increasing reduction in the proportion of the accumulation fund in national income has not produced the necessary growth of resources to be used to raise the people's living standards via the consumption fund. Why? Well, because it was "consumed" by the low efficiency of social production and the low standard of capital investments utilization.

Thus it is today that on the basis of the new economic mechanism an economic development model is being devised in which the proportions of accumulation and consumption increase and, as I have already said, so does production efficiency. How? The "plan" is already outlined by what has been said above. The growth of accumulations which directly accompanies the accelerated development of machine building and scientific and technical progress ensures an increase in the efficiency of social production as a whole. On this basis an increase in consumption.

That is precisely what is envisaged by the 12th 5-Year Plan. The growth rate in the average annual national income total is due to increase by 20 percent and the accumulation fund by 22 percent. Therefore, you will say, the bias in favor of accumulation is being intensified. However, in view of the planned efficiency of production and construction (the latter must be conducted at accelerated rates in the regions that are being opened up) it is possible in that period to ensure an increase of approximately 19 percent in the average annual growth of the consumption fund. Therefore, on the face of it the "accumulation" model of economic growth will achieve precisely what we want. It passes the test when "measured against consumption." We ourselves can see this at least from the fact that the material base of the social and cultural sphere is strengthening. The capital investments used for this purpose from the accumulation fund outstrip the growth of production investments. As for the future, the bias toward the "accumulation model" can be mitigated and accumulation itself can be stabilized. In any event, this will depend to a large extent on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and on how we fare at resource-saving.

The third and most important problem raised by V. Selyunin is the **correlation between Groups A and B.** Here, too, there must be a radical breakthrough.

In the past 15 years (through 1985) the growth of Group A industrial output has exceeded the Group B growth rate by 19 percent. Each ruble of consumer goods production required more and more output in the first group. This process led to a chronic shortage of original resources and of capital investments as well as to the "automatic development" of Group A and in particular of its fuel and raw materials sector.

Many Soviet economists are worried by the question: Has the likelihood of once more trying to achieve economic growth primarily through heavy industry not been ruled out at the present stage? That is, without considerable improvements in the level of consumption?

Given the low standard of efficiency in using all resources which has come about in past periods, there really is an actual danger of the further "automatic development" of heavy industry when, say, the acceleration of the development of machine building generates a need for virtually an equal if not a greater increase in the production of metals and plastics. The latter makes increased demands on fuel and energy resources. The fuel and energy sectors in turn are beginning to demand extra machines and equipment.

This circle of extensive development at the present stage can really be broken by reducing the consumption of all resources per unit of output—relying on scientific and technical progress, the reequipping of the production potential, and new methods of economic management. Only that way can we achieve a situation in which the growth in the production of any processing sector will not require a similar increase in heavy industry sectors. And in which a considerable proportion of resources will be channeled into the production of consumer goods and the development of the social sphere. That is the path that V. Selyunin's article defends. I am convinced that neither planners nor modern economic science would disagree with him on that score.

It should be stressed in particular that just such a path of national economic development was envisaged by the Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the Period Through 2000 and by the 12th 5-Year Plan. Sectoral ratios in the current 5-year plan are formed on the assumption that 65-70 percent of the increase in the demand for fuel and raw materials will be met by economizing. It is planned to increase by a factor of 1.7 the rate of reduction of the materials-intensiveness of the social product. The energy-intensive of the national income is planned to fall by 8.5 percent as against 5.4 percent in the previous 5-year plan. Metal-intensiveness is to fall by 14 percent as against 10 percent.

Thus, the elimination of the "automatic development" of heavy industry on the basis of resource-saving is a key element of the proportions of the 12th and subsequent 5-year plans. It is in this way, I repeat, that the means and resources for the social sphere begin to appear in increasing proportions. However, it must be noted that at the moment this most important lever is working inadequately.

Yes, there are many problems ahead. Nevertheless, the path mapped out for the immediate future is the right one. It is the reliable path of the accelerated development of our society in terms of all social and economic parameters.

From the Editorial Office [subhead]:

Many of the readers who responded to V. Selyunin's article ask us to say how it is viewed by our official organs, in particular the USSR Gosplan. So we asked L. Vid, one of its leaders, to give us Gosplan's view. L. Vid agreed to write for the newspaper but only in his capacity as an economist. The editorial office asks readers to bear this in mind and not regard the view expressed here as the stance of the USSR Gosplan.

At the same time the author's competence and his official position compel us to make a few comments on the essence of the article.

The stance taken by L. Vid, in our view, is beyond dispute. He agrees that there must be a structural change in favor of consumer goods production. But how is this to be achieved? The author speaks about the current 5-year plan targets for saving fuel, energy, and materials, which should release more resources for consumer goods production. But how are those targets to be achieved? There isn't a word about that in the article, even though more than 2 years of the 5-year plan have already elapsed. It should not be as it has been for decades, when our central economic departments outlined for us an outwardly convincing picture of the retooling of the economy without being able to calculate how many freightcars, tractors, wristwatches, skis, or tubes of toothpaste the country needs. This has happened so many times: first machine tools, then people, first oil, then bread... But surely it is that approach which resulted in people's low living standards, unforgivable under socialism, and backwardness in scientific and technical progress? Is it not finally time to learn the lesson? Both for private individuals. And even more so for those departments responsible for our economy.

The editorial office hopes that the USSR Gosplan will still set out its viewpoint on the questions raised by V. Selyunin's article, in particular:

According to what principles and on what scientific basis does the Gosplan set the targets for improving the basic proportions including the correlation between consumption and accumulation, and how specifically in these conditions does it intend to fulfill the party's requirement on radically raising people's living standards?

What conclusions have been drawn from the economic and social results of the country's development in the previous period? What are the guarantees that the concept of the 13th 5-Year Plan devised by that organ will be any different from traditional approaches?

How is it planned to enhance Gosplan's role not only in compiling but also in implementing the plan targets, including the plan targets for raising the people's living standards?

Economists Argue Need for 'Normal Market'

PM021501 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Apr 88 p 2

[Article by Doctors of Economic Sciences P. Medvedev and I. Nit under the rubric "Looking for the Right Way": "What Kind of Market?"—boldface as published]

[Text] Mikhail Antonov's article "Going One's Own Way" published in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 17 September [published in the 23 September 1987 Soviet Union DAILY REPORT p 64] last year has generated a lively discussion about the correlation between the plan and the market in our economy. The discussion's main arguments against the market are price hikes and wage differentials...

But let us investigate whether the market is to blame for this. At the sharpest turning points in history it has been the straw which we have clutched.

Just why the market flourished under the NEP is clear to everyone. In 1928 it was officially closed (that is: made illegal). But as rations became more meager and housing colder, the need for and inevitability of the market became more and more obvious. In 1932 it was authorized once again. The market operated throughout the war. At times the trade was underground, but, according to numerous accounts, the authorities turned a blind eye to this. The market has also existed ever since the war. It has always fed, dressed, or heated somebody. On the whole it has always worked, for better or worse.

People intended to discuss the market, but are actually talking about a bazaar, we will be told. Fair enough, let us switch to a "real" market—the market in means of production. It too has always existed!

Let us start with the first 5-year plans, when we switched from economic management methods to directive methods. This resulted in a sharp decline in growth rates (average annual production growth rates for the most important types of output in the 1st 5-Year Plan were

lower than those in 1926-1927 by a factor of 2-2.5). However, they remained at the 10 percent level. The reason being that the lack of coordination in the directive plan could be eliminated via an admittedly primitive but no less real market in resources between enterprises. By the mid-thirties this primitive market had developed to such an extent that growth rates had markedly increased. On the other hand, when in the late thirties any kind of informal cooperation between people became extremely dangerous, the market withered and growth rates in the forties were close to zero or even negative.

There has also been a market in means of production over the last few decades. Sometimes we have called it socialist mutual assistance—"provision of technical assistance." Sometimes we have covered it up with the meaningless words "by way of an exception." With its help we somehow managed to paper over the resource cracks in the plan.

Thus there has always been a market. And if we cannot live without it, the question of whether or not it should exist does not apply. The question is **what kind of market should it be?**

The development of a normal market is the key to radical reform. We are now reaping the consequences not of economic restructuring but of attempts to halt it. Reforms need to be automatic, and only the market can make them so. It will decide how many bureaucrats should be cut, which ministries should be abolished, and which production facilities should be expanded. It will decide this by the most democratic means—voting with rubles.

The decline of the modern market can be explained not only by bureaucratic oppression, but by the lack of money—the universal equivalent—in it. Funds, quotas, shortages, personal contacts, services, and mutual assistance serve as currency. But noncash means of payment merely follow like pale obedient ghosts behind these genuine values of our economic mechanism.

The imbalance—now at a critical level—between goods and money encourages hotheads to make pseudorevolutionary proposals. They demand that "superfluous" money be confiscated, devalued, and so forth. The fatal consequences of such measures are obvious. In an atmosphere of social fatigue and widespread skepticism, to start the reform with this would be to ruin matters. The only acceptable approach today is the mercantile route for reviving the ruble and developing the market. We propose (together with the well-known economist V. Belkin) a specific version of this route. The essence of our proposal lies, briefly, in the following.

All money earned by enterprises for the goods they sell to the population (rather than to wholesale centers) should be paid into their special bank accounts. This money presents no inflationary danger and so can be boldly paid out in the form of wages. The latter circumstance makes the money an excellent currency for wholesale trade in means of production: Nobody will buy anything that is not needed, because under such conditions stockpiling will empty their pockets. Imaginary shortages will disappear. In a instant the market will achieve what the most diligent inspectors in the world and the most ideal expenditure norms have been unable to achieve over the last 60 years...

The market will also strike a blow against current shortages. In return for money from special accounts—which will be paid into their own special accounts—producers of resources will reveal all their reserves, make more of what people need, and produce nothing that is not needed. Anything not bought by the population in principle cannot be produced. Work for "real" money will oust coercive state orders. This does not mean that tank plants will close. As the market develops this real money will increasingly flow into the budget (in the form of taxes, payments for natural resources, and so forth). Through their representatives in organs of power the population will allocate a certain sum from the budget for defense needs, and military specialists will put that money to work via state orders.

The market will improve interregional and inter-nation relations. At the moment mutual dissatisfaction is often caused by suspicions that certain areas are making a disproportionately large contribution to the state pot, while others are skimming off an unfair amount. The centralized subsidizing of certain measures in certain regions will, of course, continue. But this should be an open and conscious redistribution of money coordinated with the parties concerned.

A normal market needs a natural price formation system. Ideally, of course, all market prices would immediately be made contractual and could only be influenced indirectly—via taxes, state investment, and interest rates... However, initially this influence may be inadequate. Savings books, "socks," and "money boxes" are a powder keg under our economy and are liable, if prices are abruptly unfettered, to bring us nothing but galloping, explosive inflation. To prevent such events we need a price restraint mechanism. A group of young economists within the framework of our seminar at the Moscow State University Economics Faculty proposes introducing a system of punitive taxes which will make it advantageous for enterprises to increase the price of their products only when there has also been a noticeable increase in demand for them. This logic is simple: If you do your bit to saturate the market, you win the right to additional profit. As the market develops consumers will dictate to producers the features that a particular product should have for a particular price, or, alternatively, the price to be paid for a given set of features.

The main objection to the market is that it takes the levers of economic power away from the center. Yet these levers are so weak that there is nothing to take

away! In 60 years of directive administration not a single 5-year plan and only one annual plan have been fulfilled. On the contrary, the appearance in the budget of money as a universal equivalent will give the center a real lever of power.

Of course, we will have to smooth out many bumps along the way to a normal market: Our banking standards have fallen behind, there are no specialists in taxation policy... So, as V.I. Lenin persistently recommended, we will have to learn to trade. What if we have to! As we can see, there is no alternative. Without a normal market we will be unable to succeed in our radical economic reform, and we may kill off the people's faith in the possibility of restructuring.

State Association Regulation Change Explained

PM291019 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Apr 88 p 1

[Interview with G. Yurchenko, senior official at the USSR Council of Ministers apparatus, by special correspondent L. Skoptsov: "What Is Beneath the Guise"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction; boldface as published]

[Text] On 4 March 1988 SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA published the article "Attempts to Revive Old-style 'Main Administrationism' in a New Guise" by Candidate of Technical Sciences L. Mikhaylov from Leningrad. The response from readers shows that the writer had touched one of the nerves of the process of democratizing economic life. The idea of state production associations has undergone an important metamorphosis—from a democratic form of self-management to an intermediate administrative component—along the road toward its implementation.

In early April the USSR Council of Ministers again returned to the questions of setting up state production associations. A resolution taking full account of the requirement for production management to be democratized was adopted in place of the lapsed Resolution No 1076 of 23 September last year. Henceforth state production associations may be set up exclusively on a voluntary basis with the consent and in the interests of the equal partners—enterprises, associations, and organizations—comprising them. Our special correspondent L. Skoptsov met with G. Yurchenko, senior official in the USSR Council of Ministers apparatus, and asked him to comment on this event.

[Yurchenko] To better understand the essence of the resolution adopted by the government, it is necessary to touch on certain general questions. We have inherited many economically inefficient enterprises from the past. Their design and technological services are inadequately developed, as are their experimental production facilities. This means the economy also fails to develop. How can these enterprises be strengthened? One way is to concentrate production and create production associations and science-and-production associations. Associations which can independently solve the questions of scientific, technical, production, and social development. Associations which can operate on the principles of complete economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing with high efficiency.

State production associations are a new form of production integration. It is important to stress that the management of state production associations should be based on exclusively democratic foundations involving the voluntary association of enterprises. Their economic activity—on the basis of an umbrella enterprise—should be led by a board of directors. The directors should be equal partners.

However, in many cases the ministries have regrettably started setting up state production associations with blatant deviations from the USSR Law on the State Enterprise and breaches of the principles of voluntary associations and mutual interest. There have been examples of enterprises that have nothing in common apart from their profile and the sector to which they belong being amalgamated in state production associations.

As spot checks and attentive examination of the practice of setting up state production associations in sectors and republics has shown, union ministries and union republic councils of ministers have permitted distortions of the essence of organizational restructuring and limited the rights and independence accorded to labor collectives by the USSR Law on the State Enterprise. State production associations started being given administrative and distributive functions which were alien to them and had previously been carried out by now-abolished middle-level organs. They were often set up with an isolated management apparatus, frequently with cumbersome structures and inflated staffs. They included large science-and-production and production associations which were able to successfully carry out their own production and social development themselves.

All this created the conditions for turning state production associations into intermediate management components, blatantly violating the democratic principles of their formation.

This practice of the formation of state production associations confirms that the development of democratic foundations for management at production requires that even the very possibility of any restriction on the rights granted under the law be averted.

It was this that prompted the repeal of the Provision on the State Production Association. It was deemed necessary to disband those of them which were set up in breach of the Law on the State Enterprise. These decisions were made by ministries and departments after the

most painstaking analysis with the participation of directors and representatives of labor collectives at enterprises making up state production associations.

There are currently around 3 dozen state production associations in various sectors of the national economy. The experience of their work makes it possible to more fully and objectively assess the potential of such organizational structures.

At the same time, where expedient, existing state production associations are being consolidated and new production and science-and-production associations are being set up.

Scientific

Physicist Legasov Dies; Gorbachev Signs Obituary

LD292042 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Valeriy Legasov, an outstanding Soviet chemical physicist, a member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, first deputy director of the Kurchatov Institute of Nuclear Energy, died at the age of 51, on Wednesday, April 27.

An obituary, signed by Mikhail Gorbachev, other Soviet leaders and prominent scientists, which was published today, notes that he was associated with the Soviet Union's major achievements in the advanced section of inorganic chemistry—chemistry of noble gases. The new compounds, he obtained with his colleagues, enabled to develop a number of important applied directions of new technology. [sentence as received] His works on hydrogen power engineering and the technological use of nuclear reactors are of great importance.

As a member of the government commission, Legasov took an active part in investigating the causes of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, made a significant contribution to developing and effecting top priority measures aimed at eliminating the consequences of the accident.

Ligachev, Ryzhkov at Funeral

LD301418 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 30 Apr 88

[Excerpts] Moscow today accompanied on his last journey Academician Valeriy Alekseyevich Legasov, Soviet scientist, chemical physicist, member of the CPSU, winner of the USSR Lenin and State Prizes, member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and first deputy director of the Kurchatov Institute of Nuclear Energy. [passage omitted]

Comrades Ryzhkov, Zaykov, Ligachev, Dolgikh, and Baklanov were in the guard of honor. A solemn ceremony took place at the Novodevichiye Cemetery.

Sagdeyev Assesses 'Crisis' of 'Big Science'

PM0305092188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Academician R. Sagdeyev under the rubric "19th Party Conference: Tasks of Restructuring": "Where We Have Lost Momentum"—boldface as published]

[Text] It is scarcely necessary to prove the special role and responsibility of science in the process of society's renewal. It is not simply one of society's production forces; science embodies something new—constant movement forward in learning about the surrounding world and, indeed, about society itself. And does the development of science not provide us with a model for a democratic organism in the process of continuous restructuring, of the breakdown of existing stereotypes, and of the struggle of ideas, full of drama and eternal quest?

At the same time, science is to a considerable degree the product of the social conditions in which it develops. Preceding years have left grave, as yet unhealed, scars on this complex and vulnerable organism. Science has come to its present stage with one of the world's largest armies of workers but, unfortunately, with a less than modest service record of achievements forming part of the world treasury of knowledge.

This applies primarily to achievements in the field of so-called fundamental research. We have already grown accustomed to strewing our heads with ashes and castigating ourselves for our inability to introduce the results of fundamental research promptly into practice. We have begun to look into what is hampering applied science, and we have even set about improving the mechanism for the liaison between science and practice.

The time has come to investigate honestly and objectively the reasons for the crisis that big science is experiencing, without which applied science is impossible.

After all, fundamental work, by creating the intellectual groundwork for future applications (often unexpected for the researchers themselves) essentially becomes a real means of production.

Where is it that we have lost momentum, surrendering leading positions on a whole series of scientific salients and descending on some to the role of outsiders?

You don't have to look far for examples: In our knowledge of the microcosm, of the dozen so-called fundamental elementary particles discovered recently (about half of the building blocks of the universe known today) we did not discover a single one. As for the several hundred elementary particles which are combinations of the main particles, here we can scarcely lay claim to a contribution of more than 1-2 percent. In the study of the macrocosm, our services are just as modest. It is no accident that

terms which excite the imagination such as "quasar," "pulsar," and "barster" (heavenly bodies which suddenly flare up) have come to us from foreign languages. There are examples of the opposite, it is true: After all, the Russian word "sputnik" has entered other languages, and lasers (never mind the name) were nonetheless discovered in our country. But in knowledge of the living world, it is best to abandon comparisons immediately: That is the reward for years, no, for decades, of an orgy of Lysenkoism.

But you only have to do your sums: World science has its own, albeit unwritten, table of ranks which has not been influenced by panegyrics to nonexistent achievements heard at solemn academic (and nonacademic) sessions of previous years.

We have a diagnosis, let's turn to the history of the disease. In the period of the scientific and technical revolution, there was a rapid change in the style and methods of scientific work. It acquired an increasingly collective nature. Having become a direct production force of society, it demanded the involvement of enormous material resources. It needed increasingly complex instruments, unique testing units (like nuclear accelerators or telescopes), super computers, and so forth. Alongside research, a whole army of scientific and technical workers has been enlisted to the sphere of collective work. And all this has to be administered.

Here, alas, costs are inevitable: The organizational apparatus close to science spreads according to the same laws as the bureaucratic stratum in other spheres of society. Here **the greatest danger lies in wait for science—bureaucracy seeks to become self-contained.**

Many scientists remember the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium session nearly 20 years ago at which a discussion developed between Academicians Keldysh and Artsimovich. The debate was about the direction in which the academy was going: Would it remain the headquarters of big science, or did the fate of an ordinary sectorial ministry await it, even if that sector retained the title of science? Unfortunately, L.A. Artsimovich's fears were not unfounded. Gradually a bureaucratic style pervaded every pore of the scientific community. Interdepartmental barriers which had long protected academic science from higher education destroyed the natural link between the generations in science. This link for many centuries has enabled world science to select new recruits for itself and take them to its bosom. (The VUZ's, as centers of scientific thought, also suffered).

The disproportionate growth of many academic institutes distorted the initial essence of the scientific research institute as a flexible guided detachment of like-minded scientists, the model which the young P.L. Kapitsa and N.N. Semenov realized so successfully many years ago. In a small, compact institute with a personnel of 100-200, bureaucratic costs were minimized, while the director was not simply a scientific leader but also the young scientists' educator. Let's recall the words of the great Rutherford: "My students keep me young."

In the flurry of organizational and economic work, the leaders of today's overgrown scientific institutes have increasingly less time left not only to hand over matters to the next generation but also for their own scientific studies (if only at hobby level). We have still not really understood that giant institutes have outlived their time as the main production cell of science and have not managed to pass on this function, with all its ensuing scientific and organizational powers, to departments and laboratories whose leaders grew out of short pants long ago.

To oppose the process of the bureaucratization of science and the transfer of power to the hands of professional administrators, scientists have been obliged to undertake administrative work themselves. I know of many examples of talented scientists, under the weight of the growing volume of unrelieved organizational work, losing their creative potential for many years or even decades, and ultimately, having lost their link with laboratory work, finding themselves unable to distinguish between ideas worthy of attention and utter eyewash.

All this could not fail to affect the creative atmosphere of scientific collectives. Scientific seminars have largely lost their creative pitch. The intensiveness of scientific contacts (even within the country), which are as necessary to science as air, has declined.

The true scale of values in science has been eroded to some degree. I cannot fail to cite a profoundly meaningful joke from Academician Landau to the effect that scientists are divided into classes: In the first Einstein is on his own; in the second, there are Dirak and a number of other outstanding physicists, and so forth. All scientists from the "class society" know which class they belong to. But there is also a "classless society"—its representatives can ascribe themselves to any class.

The loss of objective criteria in science is promoting the process of descent into mediocrity, the leveling down in creative work. Forms of assessing achievements alien to the traditions and logic of scientific development have emerged: for instance, the so-called "registration of scientific discoveries." Surely a diploma on his discovery, a certificate issued by one more bureaucratic department, cannot give genuine satisfaction to a real scientist? For material incentive, we can find far more natural forms—personalized medals, bonuses, and so forth.

I remember very well the time when scientists had to assume pledges to make discoveries within specific periods. The sense of humor of the physicists of the sixties in the Novosibirsk academic township once responded to the latest regional administrative appeal with a pledge to

make, in the relevant period, one discovery of world importance, two of all-union importance, and three of Siberian importance. The laws of nature have no national boundaries, even if a decree accords world standard to a "Siberian" discovery.

The democratization of scientific life at the level of the modern institute model should unfailingly include establishing the replacement of directors in such a way that the duration of their continuous work at a leading post should not exceed 10 years—two elected terms.

The recent amendments to the USSR Academy of Sciences charter already make some provisions in this direction. Examples of institutes like the Institute of Chemical Physics, whose founder and unreplaced leader was the Nobel Prize winner and outstanding chemist N.N. Semenov show where working to the point of exhaustion leads for both the director and the institute.

Finally an age limit has been set for top administrative posts: 65 for an "ordinary mortal" (for instance a doctor of sciences), 70 for a rank and file academy member, and 75 for presidium members. Not only the halfheartedness but also the illogic of the graduated criterion is immediately apparent. In defending this approach in my answers to questions from members of the audience, who for some reason have become more curious in the era of glasnost, I tried to cite the unusual health of my brothers in the academy as the result of natural selection. Indeed, even this statutory rule will go into force fully only in a few years. An age limit is not yet replacement.

Incidentally, how does the practice of world science resolve this question? In France, the term as director is limited to 12 years. The Max Planck Society (essentially the FRG Academy of Sciences) established a system of collective leadership after the war: three or four co-directors, each of whom performs the functions of administrative director for 3 years according to a sliding schedule. The efficiency of this system is borne out by the world recognition won by FRG scientists in recent years. In the United States, there are no legal norms for replacement. And they are not needed. American science has firmly asserted the tradition of intensive moves, migrations, and transfers, ensuring an influx of "new blood" so necessary for creative work. Active scientific life is dispersed over dozens of scientific centers of approximately equal value (as a rule, attached to universities).

Of course, by virtue of attendant circumstances (above all, the housing problem), we are deprived of this opportunity, not to mention the fact that a Moscow registration permit has become virtually synonymous with "the rank of gentleman." Once, at a Kremlin reception, P.L. Kapitsa said to N.S. Khrushchev: "If in our day, Lomonosov were to arrive in Moscow on foot, we would not be able to employ him." After these words, the talented young physicist (now one of the most famous physical theorists), on whose behalf Kapitsa was pleading, did get his Moscow registration permit after all. For understandable reasons we cannot recommend this method as a system. Perhaps it would be worthwhile for the academy to construct at least a small amount of housing which would make it possible to invite scientists to major scientific centers for long periods of practical experience (up to several years).

The system of planning from what has been achieved, which has spontaneously taken shape over many years, has caused great harm to our science.

This system obviously complies to a greater degree with and impresses the bureaucratic approach of the overcautious. Indeed, it is far simpler, instead of a complex in-depth analysis of the development trends of particular salients, to follow the example of the ill-starred meteorologist who forecasts today's weather for tomorrow. But science should know how to compile a scientific forecast not merely for itself.

Science's new social task, whose importance will constantly increase, is to give scientifically substantiated recommendations on all questions concerning the future of regions, the country, and the planet—since man, in his interaction with nature, long since went beyond the stage of the overindulgence accord to a trailblazer.

Unfortunately, we in the Academy of Sciences and in sectorial science sometimes treat forecast compiling work as a tedious additional chore. Then we begin to worry frantically, recarving approved plans under the pressure of unpredicted and previously unconsidered circumstances.

Of course, in science there will always be a place for unexpected discoveries and findings: That is its attraction. But the sensible distribution of finances and the investment of material resources in the most promising fields will only increase the number of pleasant surprises. Fundamental research in general has for many years failed to enjoy the privileges which exist for many applied studies. In the language of the economist of the past, fundamental science could not be relegated to group "A," which produces the means of production. That is why it has not been a target for priority accelerated development, with all ensuing consequences. That is not only a loss of moral prestige but also a problem of young scientists' "bread and butter."

The new thinking, which takes into account the mutual links between all types and stages of scientific activity, inevitably leads us to the conclusion that the creation of the intellectual groundwork for future introductions and practical proposals is nothing other than the creation of the means of production in their supreme modern form. It is no accident that Japan, having accomplished a revolutionary leap in technology and the organization of industrial production thanks, it is customary to believe,

to the skilled use of foreign patents and the extremely effective organization of labor, is now reorienting itself toward the accelerated development of its own fundamental science.

But are we ready for a truly comprehensive approach in planning wide-scale scientific and technical progress programs?

In many cases, the Academy of Sciences—the main headquarters for big science—acts as the sectors' modest partner. Inasmuch as the sectors have at their disposal incomparably greater production capacities and a more advanced technological basis.

Departmental barriers are promoting a situation where the group interests of particular designers and developers and sector leaders (whole lobbies have already taken shape) often prove higher than the interests of science or even simple common sense. In many cases (often without any reason), we are impeded by forbidden zones restricting glasnost and democratic example.

I shall cite an example from my own field. We are witnessing a stormy, sometimes dramatic discussion in the West about selecting the most sensible combination of manned and automatic spacecraft, the optimum combination from the viewpoint of scientific interests. The leaders of U.S. astronautics have recognized that the shuttle program was an historical error. But a number of unique astronomical instruments, in whose development European scientists took part with Americans, are waiting to be launched, which can only be done with the aid of the shuttle.

Our American counterparts are voicing serious anxiety over the fact that many future scientific projects will also be linked to the next stage of expensive manned flights within the framework of orbital space stations. The aerospace business, which has received a substantial order, has won this debate. But it is a pity, because life has shown that virtually all basic scientific results (except for space medicine) have been obtained by automated instruments.

The establishment of the optimum balance on a sensible basis has not happened either in the United States or in our country. Yet while the great space powers are vying with each other in attempts to put impressive structures (orbital stations populated by representatives of the human race) into orbit, small Japanese robots have won the commercial market on earth.

Yes, we are proud of our outstanding achievements in X-ray astronomy which have led to the discovery of hard radiation from a supernova which flared up last year. This was done with the aid of the "Quantum" module international observatory on the "Mir" station. This is seemingly a weighty argument in the debate. Unless, it is true, you consider the fact that we had to share priority in discovering the supernova's X-ray radiation with an observatory on a miniature Japanese automated satellite named "Ginga" [name as published].

The planning of science presupposes the correct distribution of funds for various items of expenditure. For instance, if all funds are put into unique scientific installations—testing units on which some types of particularly important research are to be undertaken—but diagnostic instruments and processing facilities are forgotten, then the capital investments will be withdrawn from circulation. This would seem to be clear to anyone, yet something similar did once happen with the unique 6-meter optical telescope in the North Caucasus.

Speaking today of the shortage of means of automation and computers is like discovering America. This chronic illness will hardly be helped by directive measures like the announcement of special vacancies at academy elections. Yet among members of the American Academy of Sciences, I did not encounter the names of the developers of the renowned supercomputers; but supercomputers do exist in America, and they are working. Moreover, they have already become commonplace auxiliary instruments. The incentives promoting the development of this fundamentally important sector of technology are obviously working effectively.

It is believed that the extensive use of computers in routine operations to automate laboratory work increases the efficiency of scientific work approximately tenfold. But computers also provide a new quality and make it possible to conduct studies and analyses which are inaccessible to traditional methods.

In terms of its provision with instruments and computers, the army of our scientific workers and engineers is reminiscent of a home guard armed with cross bows. Alas, under the conditions of shortage, the question of the profitability of the independent nonseries planning and production of computers, which even academic institutes cannot dismiss, does not even arise.

Had we at the Space Research Institute not embarked promptly on the development of special "homegrown" computers in processing results of the encounters between the "Vega" spacecraft and Halley's Comet, we would have been unable to keep up with the computer team of the European "Giotto" comet probe, which flew by the comet just a few days later.

It is virtually impossible to achieve leading positions in world science and consolidate our hold in world science without full international ties. Global interdependence affects the life of the world scientific community most powerfully of all.

The breakdown of stereotypes of behavior is now also taking place in this area. I remember how many years ago, as a young scientist, with my colleagues I listened to the parting words of a skilled administrator seeing us off

on a trip to a big international conference: "Obviously you will not manage to avoid contacts. Your task is to show a kopek's worth and learn a ruble's worth." He was right—we did indeed not manage to avoid contacts, yet honest scientific partnership complies to a kind of law of communicating vessels.

Now, looking back over the path I have traveled, I cannot imagine my scientific work outside the world scientific community. It is a pity that our young scientists have no opportunity take a full part in the unprecedented process of truly worldwide integration which has encompassed modern science. It is hard to imagine P.K. Kapitsa without the several years he spent with Rutherford, or L.D. Landau without his work with Niels Bohr.

It was perhaps the spirit of international scientific brotherhood of the scientific schools of different countries formed in close joint work which ultimately led to the emergence of outstanding international movements of scientists (like the Pugwash movement) within whose depths the outlines of the new thinking arose. During the implementation of the "Vega" and "Phobos" projects, international collectives were formed. These are the prototype for a future world family of scientists which will be able to tackle any tasks of our complex interdependent world. This world will be free from the danger of nuclear self annihilation and will have finally dropped from the face of science the "veil" that had been successfully retained in the era of old thinking with references to secrecy and embargoes.

Minister Lukonin on AES Safety Developments

PM030809 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Apr 88 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Interview with Minister of Atomic Power N.F. Lukonin by TASS special correspondents V. Itkin and L. Chernenko specially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Safety Margin"; date and place not given—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Maximum safety—it is to achieve that aim that scientists, designers, and production workers engaged in the development, planning, and creation of equipment for AES's, as well as those who operate that equipment, have been pooling their efforts. Before the Chernobyl accident, the nuclear power industry's track record was virtually perfect—it had totaled up 4,000 "reactor years" of confident working. Now the discussion centers on ways to restore public opinion's confidence in the peaceful atom. What is being done to achieve that? With that question, we begin our conversation with Nikolay Fedorovich Lukonin, USSR minister of nuclear power generation.

[Lukonin] Indeed, there are quite a few difficulties in the development of the nuclear power industry now. It is no secret that it has its opponents. Our efforts aimed at ensuring maximum security must be all the more responsible and substantial. It must be noted that the problem of increasing safety exists not only in the nuclear power industry; it is also relevant to a number of other sectors and for technology as a whole. A "safety margin" is built into all equipment—from a car to equipment for a large chemical enterprise. In our sector, however, this safety margin must be immeasurably greater.

For that reason, we have reviewed many things since Chernobyl. The nuclear and physical characteristics of Chernobyl-type reactors have been altered with the result that they are now fundamentally safer. The technical measures carried out at all such power units make it possible to preclude a serious accident even if the unlikely happens—a repetition of the kind of mistakes made by the staff at the Chernobyl AES.

Even since taking such radical measures we have returned to these questions several times and have found new solutions which increase equipment safety. The main conclusion here is that there must be no stagnation or complacency in the work of improving AES equipment. There must be a constant search for new paths and reserves here.

The very approach to the problem of nuclear power station safety has changed, too. In the past, a whole series of events were taken into account in the design of AES's so as to prevent serious damage. But in the development of any large-scale technology, there is always the possibility of the occurrence of a sequence of unfavorable events which may subsequently lead to an accident. Furthermore, this is true not only of the nuclear power industry but also of other sectors, such as the chemical industry and transport. Taking account of this possible course of events, a probabilistic safety analysis is now being developed. Postulating certain initial potential deviations, we trace the whole chain of events which could occur, not two or three events but considerably more—dozens of events, that is, the whole chain. At the same time, we try to determine the weakest links in the whole layout of a nuclear power station and find the equipment which may be unreliable. Having ascertained that, we take the necessary technical measures.

Many scenarios are being explored. We are even looking at the least likely chain of circumstances. Measures are being taken to enable us to localize an accident even if there is a reactor seal failure or a core meltdown.

Work is in progress to increase the reliability of cooling systems. Regardless of whether or not the power unit is running, heat has to be extracted from the reactor core. Pumps, ventilators, and pipes must never fail. That requires electricity. To supply an AES with electricity even in the event of a power unit stoppage, the station is linked up to three or four power lines. If those lines suffer an outage, too, provision is made for the possibility of using diesel motors to generate electricity. If the diesels fail and the AES is deprived of its sources of electricity, the task of cooling the reactor is taken over by air-cooled heat exchangers which need no electricity.

They will remove the heat from the first circuit. All these measures will enable the normal cooling of the reactor under all conditions and will prevent it from overheating.

Measures have also been taken in the event of a rise in pressure under the containment structure. Special filters are being developed capable of releasing pressure from under the containment structure.

The layout of AES equipment is being improved. It is being arranged so that power lines and water conduits do not intersect. The ducts carrying the cables which ensure the operation of the containment system are being separated. There are several of these systems, and they are now arranged in various groups.

There are plans afoot to isolate each power unit. As you will recall, there was one common machine hall at Chernobyl for all four power units. Now, however, we are working to seal off all power units and give each one its own machine hall.

New equipment and materials are being developed for the nuclear power industry. We are now using fire-resistant cable at AES's. Whereas before a smoldering cable helped fire to spread, the new type of cable does not burn. The roofing of AES buildings is now being made of non-combustible materials. Vigorous efforts are being made to improve the quality of the equipment supplied to AES's. AES instruments are being improved, and the components of automated control systems are being upgraded.

Additional safety measures are being implemented at all existing AES's and those under construction. This needed considerably extra expenditure and led in a number of cases to equipment standing idle, increased construction costs, and extended construction times. This affected, for example, the construction of two units at the Smolensk AES, where Chernobyl-type reactors are being used. Two similar units are being built at the Kursk AES, and another—with a capacity of 1.5 million kilowatts—is being built at the Ignalina AES.

In the future, development of the nuclear power industry will be based on light-water [VVER] reactors. In the long term, development will be based on the design of the Zaporozhskaya AES using VVER-1000 type reactors. This is a standardized plan which is being duplicated. Work is in progress to create a new generation of enhanced-safety reactors. In addition to new technical facilities to enhance safety, this plan will incorporate ideas to improve efficiency.

Work is being carried out on the construction of heat-supply nuclear power stations in Voronezh and Gorkiy. A new step was taken in the nuclear power industry's development when it was decided to build two nuclear stations using a new type of reactor. These are the so-called helium-cooled high-temperature reactors. Nuclear power stations based on them will be built during the 13th and 14th 5-Year Plans. AES'S of this type will tackle the problem not only of municipal and domestic heat supply but also of industrial heat supply and will be used in such energy-intensive industries as metallurgy and chemicals.

[Correspondent] However much nuclear power station technology and equipment are improved and however many additional safety systems are introduced, much will still depend on the man standing at the AES control panel. What measures are being taken to ensure that human error is eliminated and staff training improved?

[Lukonin] Staff at all the AES's in the country are being reassessed. The situation which led to the Chernobyl accident is being thoroughly examined within each station's collective. Many specialists from various AES's took part in eliminating its aftereffects and saw with their own eyes the results that incompetence, negligence, and breaches of the rules can have. They have now seen for themselves the enormous price of sloppy work and are making every effort to prevent a recurrence. Everyone involved in the work of an AES understands that what happened at Chernobyl must not happen again. People are doing their utmost to achieve that by deepening their knowledge and improving and developing their skills.

There must be no slacking by those in charge of the control panel. Two study and training centers have been set up at the Smolensk and Novovoronezhskaya AES's to train staff to operate correctly in emergencies. More than 100 reactor accidents and emergencies are simulated there using computer models. The computer technology which simulates the processes occurring inside the reactor is not fast enough, and its memory capacity and reliability are inadequate. But work is continuing to improve the simulators.

Around 200 specialists have been trained at the centers. This year it is planned to train 2,200 AES workers there. Training such as this not only conditions staff to respond automatically but also broadens their knowledge and experience.

Increased demands have also been made on the selection of specialists. Whereas before they only had to satisfy the medical commission, now a psychological and physiological selection has been added to the system as well. The point is that there are people who, despite their abilities and knowledge, are not fit to operate an AES control panel because of their psychological and physiological characteristics. For example, they cannot respond simultaneously to visual and auditory warning signals. They begin to panic on duty and become agitated, which ultimately leads to mistakes being made. The use of psychophysiological tests enables us to evaluate such people and transfer them to other work. To summarize,

operating an AES control panel requires not only extensive and thorough knowledge and automatic skills but also strong nerves, psychological stability, and quick reactions.

Adjustments have also been made to the training of AES specialists in VUZ's. That task is now entrusted to a smaller number of educational establishments. The fact is that at one time, our specialism was fashionable and new departments were created in a number of VUZ's, which had neither the appropriate base nor experienced cadres for that purpose. Their graduates did not have sufficient training for work in our sector. Now those departments have been reduced in number, but measures must also be taken to improve the quality of training. Practical experience occupies a special place in the training plan.

Educational work with staff must be constant and painstaking. It is aimed, on the one hand, at strengthening performance discipline and, on the other, making people think and act creatively and responsibly. Embellishment, distortion, and prejudice are absolutely intolerable in our work. There must be the maximum objectivity.

Mistakes must not be covered up; it is necessary to investigate them thoroughly and learn from them. Staff must not carry out orders unthinkingly. Every worker must be clearly aware of the consequence of his action at the control panel. Yes, it is an enormous responsibility, but people must not be afraid to assume that responsibility, for example when the reactor has to be shut down. Supposing the fears prove to be false. You should not punish a worker for that. Otherwise, when a real danger arises, he will think that he will be punished again for closing the reactor down. That is why educational work is particularly important in nuclear power station collectives and why an individualized approach to each person is necessary. It should be recognized that improving human relations is considerably harder than improving equipment....

[Correspondent] How are things at the Chernobyl AES these days?

[Lukonin] The situation is stabilized at the Chernobyl AES, and normal work is in progress. This year more than 6.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity have been generated. The second and third power units are operating at their rated capacity, and the first has been halted for routine maintenance. Last year the station's staff received a radiation dose of 1.45 rems, which is far below the medically permitted dose for full-time AES workers of 5 rems a year. In the first quarter of 1988, the average exposure per person fell by a factor of 2.4 compared with the same period last year. But decontamination work on and around the Chernobyl AES site continues.

The main thing for the Chernobyl AES now is to switch from the tour-of-duty [vakhtovyy] method of work to a conventional work regime. Staff find the tour-of-duty method onerous. Thus from 1 October this year, it is planned to transfer the station to a normal 6-hour schedule. This is made possible by the fact that the new town of Slavutich is being built for the Chernobyl AES operational workers. Some 150,000 square meters of housing have already been built, and a further 150,000 square meters will be commissioned by the end of the year. The town already has its first inhabitants. Over 180 permits have already been issued. The construction of Slavutich is comprehensive—in addition to housing, they are building schools, kindergartens, a sports and health complex, and a self-service department store. Those facilities are already in operation. The creation of Slavutich will finally enable the Chernobyl AES to introduce a normal work routine.

[Correspondent] What is the condition of power unit number four? How securely is it sealed, and is it having an effect on the environment?

[Lukonin] The fourth unit has been securely mothballed and equipped with a comprehensive automatic monitoring system. The situation is being constantly checked. Specialists are on duty around the clock. The unit is covered with instruments. We are monitoring its every "dying breath." The processes in operation there are exactly as the physicists predicted—everything is running according to plan. The release of energy is falling, as is the temperature. It is now around 50 degrees centigrade. Much research work is being conducted at the site by scientists from the I.V. Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy. In short, the rumors that the reactor is coming back to life and that the situation has deteriorated are utterly groundless. The facility is in a normal sealed state.

[Correspondent] As is well known, the life expectancy of a nuclear station is 30-40 years. At the end of that period, there is the problem of mothballing the exhausted power units. How are we approaching that problem now? What experience have we gained?

[Lukonin] Yes, some power units are already approaching the end of their life span. At the Novovoronezhskaya AES, for instance, they have already begun dismantling and mothballing the first unit. The decommissioned reactor is being drained of its nuclear fuel. The first unit at the Belorussian station has also come to the end of its operating life. Either this year or next, we shall begin mothballing and dismantling it.

This is a very costly operation. It needs specialized robot equipment. For that purpose the "Spetsatom" organization has been created which will plan, produce, and test robot equipment destined for work in extreme conditions.

[Correspondent] The sector's headquarters came into being only 2 years ago. What role has the creation of the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation played?

[Lukonin] The creation of the ministry made it possible to carry out more purposeful work on questions of increasing AES safety, on planning and constructing new stations, and solving questions with the subcontractors supplying us with equipment. An opportunity also arose to comprehensively resolve the sector's problems, to highlight the bottlenecks, and work to eliminate them. Contacts between scientists, designers, and planners and station operators improved. Sometimes planners produced their solutions without heeding the opinion of AES workers. Now no designer takes estimates on trust. There must be hard evidence and practical verification. This requires two-way contacts and dialogue. This sense of community produces decisions aimed at increasing equipment reliability.

Problems still exist in our reciprocal dealings with subcontractors. Last year the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems, and the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building did not fulfill the plan for the supply of nuclear power industry equipment. There was a major backlog in construction and assembly work at the Smolensk AES's third unit. These are not simply problems for our department alone. The development of the nuclear power industry is a statewide matter. There are special demands on quality and reliability here. We hope that the creation of AES equipment of a high technical standard will provide our industry with a good schooling in high quality work and a source of experience which will be applied in other sectors as well.

'Mir' Cosmonauts' Activities Continue

LD030917 Moscow TASS in English 0901 GMT 3 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 3 TASS—By a TASS special correspondent at the Mission Control Center:

Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are continuing their space flight aboard the orbiting research platform Mir.

They are completing work with the Progress-35 freighter. The cargoes delivered by it have been moved to the platform and the fuel tanks of the combined propulsion unit filled up with fuel and an oxidizing agent.

The cosmonauts today are loading spent equipment into the freighter's emptied cargo hold.

The crew today are also to conduct several photography sessions focusing on individual areas on earth and carry out an experiment aiming to determine the dynamic characteristics of the orbiting platform and to evaluate the strains acting on it.

According to elemetry data and the cosmonauts' reports, the flight of the manned platform Mir is proceeding normally.

Briefs

'Fedorov' Expedition Successful

The scientific ship "Akademik Fedorov," having covered 34,000 miles, is setting out into the Atlantic. The diesel-electric ship "Mikhail Somov" has also set a course for home, leaving the stern shores of the sixth continent. The "Akademik Fedorov" has been congratulated on the successful completion of its Antarctic operation. The ship is currently on course for the coast of Argentina, where it will pick up cargo. This is the first experiment in commercial activity in the practice of Soviet Antarctic expeditions. [Summary] [*LD022335 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 2 May 88*]

Military

False Alarm Shows Need for Civil Defense Review

LD301513 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 29 Apr 88

[Text] An alarm set off by mistake by the local civil defense department in the city of Perm in the Ural mountains has shown that the city was not prepared for actions in case of emergency. Civil defense in this country is considered as a means of protection against consequences of industrial accidents and national calamities. If the alarm signal was real, there could be another tragedy similar to that in Chernobyl. National daily IZVESTIYA, which reported the incident, believed that it's time to review the whole system of civil defense, which has not been updated for dozens of years.

Complaints Aired About VUZ Military Training

PM011821 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by own special correspondent L. Levitskiy: "Mutterings in the Ranks and Discussion in VUZ Departments about Students' Military Training"]

[Text] Tartu-Tomsk-Moscow—A platoon of history students at Tartu University refused to put on their canvas-top boots without foot cloths. Platoon is the correct term because the classes were taking place at the Department of Military Science on a military service day. Regulations make no allowance for refractoriness. The officers—department lecturers—interpreted it as "mutiny" and condemned the attitude of the future reserve lieutenants in corresponding language. There was nothing for it but to breach regulation discipline a second time by seeking collective protection with the prorector, Doctor of Biological Sciences Yu. Kryarner. They asked just one thing, that their action or breach of regulations be investigated on the basis of health and hygiene considerations rather than the standpoint of politics or the international situation.

The prorector was able to soberly defuse the reaction to the event, although he was later taken to task over this: Foot cloths are not a professor's business. A department of military science is a department of military science and has its own procedures. But there are reasonable limits to any procedure, objected the prorector: Who wants an ugly story to develop "out of foot cloths."

At the same time an emergency party meeting was held at Tomsk University, thousands of kilometers away from Tartu. Opening it, Party Bureau Secretary A. Beloborodov moved that a draft resolution be approved. It began as follows: In condemnation of the conduct of Communist students who did not report for military training classes. Students, for the most part former soldiers, refused to attend military training classes.

To condemn or not to condemn. Here a philosopher spoke up and "took direct aim": Such actions play into the hands of the imperialists. Almost half of those who were present—young men who joined the party while on active service in the Army—were immediately put down as "accomplices."

The incident at the Tomsk University Department of Military Science is far more complicated than in Tartu. Sophomores in six departments had scarcely removed their army uniforms before they were overwhelmed by the intensity of student life. The young men had managed to forget much of what they learned at school and during the first year before the draft. The university did not take account of the fact that the potential of former soldiers is not limitless. Given the study assignments facing them, the military workload—the weekly military day and the compulsory preparation for it in the Department of Military Science—appeared clearly excessive. There was a lack of self-confidence, fear of the flood of examinations, and lack of time to make up for what had been forgotten or neglected—and the collective psychological outburst of overwrought people struck out at the "obtrusive" Department of Military Science.

This did not happen suddenly, in a short period of time. The events came to a head openly and publicly. The history, law, philosophy, journalism, biology, chemistry, and physics students expressed their discontent at the organization of military training, the quality of the teaching, and the attitude of a number of lecturers to them. Criticism was also voiced at party meetings. The students turned to the deans and the rector's office, verbally and in writing. Finally, Rector Yu. Makushin instructed the Department of Military Science to circulate a questionnaire (this in a university which has its own sociology unit) and determine the format of the classes and measures to improve them in light of the young people's opinion.

Officers and lecturers in the Department of Military Science started on the questionnaire in their own fashion. Third- and fourth-year students were sat down in their classrooms. The introduction to the questionnaire—the department's standpoint—was dictated to them. They were then instructed to fill out the questionnaires bearing their name. Majors and lieutenants walked through the rows, stemming any breaches of discipline, as they saw it. The conclusion of the questionnaire was that 53 percent of students were in favor of retaining the "military day" and the previous procedures. A triumph of democracy? At any rate, a sigh of relief was breathed in the rector's office and at the party committee.

"The poll was quite improper. The opinion of sophomores—and there are more of them and they have the greatest difficulties—was not even asked. No one informed them about the results of the poll. This disdain also offended the young men. It became clear: Our problems were of no concern to anyone in the university. They began to see the and did not report to military classes, wanting thereby to draw attention to themselves."

Time has not yet removed the sense of grievance felt by Sasha Polishchuk, Komsomol organizer of one of the departments and chairman of the organizational committee set up by the students to sort out the problems of military training—grievance caused during a party meeting at the department by absurd accusations of "aiding and abetting" imperialists. The instinctive readiness of the instructors to launch into an attack on the students without going into the heart of the matter was striking. Fortunately, other lecturers were found. A. Knigin drastically altered the course of the meeting by bluntly stating that it was absurd to seek provocateurs and make rash negative judgments.

Sasha Polishchuk was drafted into the forces from the university. He served in the Air Force. He was accepted as a candidate party member there. He was demobilized into the reserve with the rank of junior sergeant. On returning to the university he was surprised to discover that the attitude of the Department of Military Science toward him and and freshmen who had performed military service was the same as before. They were treated like spoiled youngsters who did not have a clue about the army. The curriculum and the forms and method of teaching had undergone no modification. Yet how many of these students were reserve lieutenants in the making? More than 90 percent of sophomores were army men, around 70 percent being junior commanders. And yet another contradiction: Only 8 percent of the former soldiers had mastered a skill in the Army closely related to their military training at the department. Missilemen, signalers, artillery men, and sailors had to retrain as motorized riflemen. The statistics—these were discovered later when the student organizing committee carried out its own questionnaire—showed a striking mismatch. Does this not indicate a waste of time and effort? The questionnaire showed up another factor:

More than 80 percent of the young men favored a change in the forms and methods of military training in the VUZ. A quite different conclusion from that drawn in the first questionnaire.

Why, then, was the students' opinion "unheeded"?

"We refused to capitulate to them and acknowledge their victory." This was repeated to me word for word in the military and civil departments. People sought to convince me that such behavior on the part of young men was the consequence of a general decline in discipline, in which press workers also played a part.

"Who, though, is discontented? Who is demanding changes and reforms?... They are those students who neglect their studies." I am quoting here from a letter written by Lieutenant Colonel V. Dmitruk, lecturer in the Institute of Automated Control Systems and Electronic Engineering Department of Military Science, published in the Tomsk Oblast newspaper. "...I find it difficult to understand these young men who have already paid their debt to the motherland and served in the Army in discharge of their internationalist duty. Why do they accede to those who in a provocative and underhand way cast aspersions on our army and military service and incite young people to protest against military work in the VUZ's?"

Oh, those suspicions! How common and dangerous it is to allude to them and complain about organs lacking in vigilance. But is insisting on improvements, changes, and reforms really less patriotic than defending the outdated work organization? A readiness to defend is the first commandment, assimilated by man long before the invention of gunpowder and paper. But he must be a real defender, not merely one listed as such at the military commissariat.

The conflicts broke out in Tartu and in the VUZ's in Tomsk—the polytechnic, the Institute of Automated Control Systems and Electronic Engineering, and the university—for various reasons, but they did not occur in a vacuum. They are rooted in dissatisfaction with the present-day system of military training in VUZ's and the procedure whereby students discharge their military obligations. Why, then, did all this suit everyone until recently?.. Let us look at the history.

...To ensure that every graduate from a civil VUZ was ready for the role of commander in the speciality closest to the one studied at the VUZ and was lacking only in a little practical training M.V. Frunze, USSR people's commissar for military and naval affairs, proposed that reserve commanders be instructed in VUZ's and technical colleges. This training replaced compulsory service as a military cadre.

The present Law "On Universal Military Service," adopted in 1967, is not so categorical. The deferment of drafting for active service to continue one's studies is only granted to students at fulltime day institutes included on the list of VUZ's established by the USSR Council of Ministers at the behest of the USSR Gosplan and the Ministry of Defense.

Deferment was granted for the good of the country, which needed engineers, doctors, teachers, amd economists. But drawing on my own experience, exemption was seen by us as a benefit. Personal interest wholly coincided with society's needs.

Students are now deprived of the right to defer the draft. This break of 2-3 years has caused higher education very acute problems, for which it has proven unprepared. Army men's first year falls outside the natural process of instruction. It is unlikely that the loss of 1 year can be made up in 1 semester in the 2d year while continuing to make progress at the former rate and without harming the quality of education, particularly in technical VUZ's. The question is whether to restructure fundamentally the curriculum for students going into the army or change the period of their draft. For example, the break between the 1st and 2nd year courses cannot be made up when it comes to training mathematicians and those in narrow areas of basic science—if creative mathematical abilities are not developed during this time, they will deteriorate.

One thing is clear: The quality of specialists' training must not suffer. Ultimately the country's defense depends on the kind of engineers and scientists we produce. The definitive solution of the question must obviously be dictated by society's long-term interests.

But for the time being some of the young men who have returned from the Army find continuing their studies beyond them. An abnormal situation.

"We send down 600-700 soldiers a year," affirmed L. Yerofeyev, secretary of the Tomsk Polytechnical Institute party committee.

We are losing engineers, we are also future reserve officers.

"We have done our duty. We undergo military training a second time in the departments. Then we can be drafted as officers on active service again. Why are a citizen's duties determined not by the law but by his education?" asked the young men in Tartu and Tomsk. It is simpler to accuse them of being "unpatriotic" than to answer them. The doctors of juridical sciences have found no clear answer in the present Law on Universal Military Service.

Why I have to make this point: Otherwise, it is impossible to understand the mood of those soldiers who have returned to civilian life... and the military science department. Here you have the seed of the conflicts which have occurred. The soil was provided by the system of military education in some VUZ's, which has not kept pace with life. Some 18-20 percent of study time

is spent on it each week and in harsh conditions. The military training day is fixed by army regulations. A rigorous requirement. But unlike the Army the routine at the military science department at Tomsk University was arranged in such a way that the young men were not able to have breakfast or lunch. Furthermore, they have to spend the entire day in a ramshackle, semiderelict building.

So much nervous and physical energy is wasted by officers and students worrying about haircuts, clothing, footwear, moustaches, and beards. The dividing line between a commander's exactingness and his crudeness and subjectivism in tests and examinations is a matter of the officer's culture and teaching skill. But who are the teachers in military departments? That is the question. There are many military departments in the country but the teachers there with an academic degree or the title of lecturer are extremely rare. It doesn't matter, degrees aren't necessary. But as they said at the former Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, some officers in those departments have neither higher education nor teacher training. There is another sensitive issue here: There are virtually no Estonians among the teachers of military subjects in Estonian institutes, for example.

VUZ's are where cadres are forged. For the Army just as much as for the national economy.

"On questions of military activity particular attention should be drawn to eliminating all phenomena capable of arousing in the student the thought that he is wasting his time." M.V. Frunze's warning from 60 years ago has been forgotten. Military science departments are no substitute for real modern educational centers, and higher education alone cannot raise them to that level. The Ministry of Defense only provides the institutes with equipment. Economic accountability ties established between higher education and sectors do not extend to it...

Students' dissatisfaction with military training is deep-rooted. That is why this dissatisfaction has erupted so energetically and uncontrollably. The reaction of VUZ leaders to it was varied. Polytechnic rector I. Chuchalin, party committee secretary L. Yerofeyev, and military department chief A. Deryayev assumed full responsibility and in light of students' views changed the study procedure. The conflict was resolved in days.

The conflagration at the university did not set the alarm bells ringing. Rector Yu. Makushkin did not dare to imitate the polytechnic staff's experiment. He did not have assistants like those of I. Chuchalin to share the risk with him. And a representative of the RSFSR Ministry of Higher Education ended a meeting with the young men at the university by exclaiming: Who gave you permission to discuss the organization of military work?

What questions were the students asking? That military work be brought into line with their previous army training. That was all. The suggestions made by students in Tomsk, Novosibirsk, and Estonia coincided exactly. No one who met with them disputed the logic of their suggestions. But... Both the military and the civil instructors worriedly cited those higher up: They will not understand. To a certain extent the situation was resolved by the Ministry of Defense itself, which set an example of activeness and flexibility here. The training program was reviewed and considerably streamlined. VUZ rectors were empowered to plan the forms of training. The ministry has ceased to look suspiciously at whose ideas and whose victory it is. It is a COMMON [capitalization as published] one—and we must go on working for it together.

Life is a great source of paradoxes. I have recently finished reading a research study entitled "The Adolescent Syndrome," written by philosophy teachers at Tomsk University. The essence of it is that students do not believe they can influence the restructuring of higher education. Hence their passivity. But I found the opposite. Young people's activeness at the university foundered on the "teachers' "adolescent syndrome."

I have a copy of ZA SOVETSKUYU NAUKU. One half of it is devoted to a condemnation of the students' actions written with hindsight—after the event. There is no analysis of the situation or of its causes. The students' organizing committee is condemned without the right to reply. Even though it was the indifference of the university's administration and social organs which caused the outburst of emotions and wrecked the business-like dialogue.

The old faceless obedience has outlived itself. The country needs active individuals with views and onvictions of their own. Individuals capable of defending those views and convictions. At the moment, however, we all—young and old alike—are merely studying democracy, with the concomitant risk of heated arguments and even some losses. But if we are frightened of them and try to keep thought and civic activeness within the confines of what was permitted in past decades, will that not prevent forward movement. Restructuring inevitably involves surprises and requires unusual solutions. If one examines with a suspicious eye the students' by no means blameless action, "outside interference" immediately begins to appear. But supposing we look from the viewpoint of society's interests? What benefit is there in the fact that military training at military studies departments is being brought up to date—that it is becoming a more concentrated and rational and organic part of VUZ activity? A benefit to the quality of engineers' and officers' training. And that is in the interests of all society.